

PN
45
N412

A
A
0
0
1
2
2
3
8
2
8
3



UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY

LITERATURE

CARDINAL NEWMAN



EDITED BY

GILBERT J. GABRAGHAN, S.J.



THE LIBRARY
OF
THE UNIVERSITY
OF CALIFORNIA
LOS ANGELES

IN MEMORY OF

MRS. VIRGINIA B. SPORER

LITERATURE

CARDINAL NEWMAN

GILBERT J. GARRAGHAN, S.J.

L I T E R A T U R E

A LECTURE

BY

JOHN HENRY CARDINAL NEWMAN

EDITED WITH NOTES AND STUDIES

BY

GILBERT J. GARRAGHAN, S.J.

ST. LOUIS UNIVERSITY

NEW YORK

SCHWARTZ, KIRWIN & FAUSS

COPYRIGHT, 1912, BY
SCHWARTZ, KIRWIN & FAUSS

174
45
1841-6

PREFATORY NOTE

The present edition of Cardinal Newman's *Literature* looks to a double end. It aims both to introduce the student to the critical analysis of a prose style of acknowledged excellence and to serve him as a starting point in his acquisition of a body of sound principle and theory regarding literature and its problems. It is perhaps superfluous to say that Newman's style is one to be particularly commended to the student of composition; it is clear, vigorous, winning, notably free from exaggeration and mannerism, and, in a word, inclusive to a remarkable degree of all the fundamental qualities of good writing. The rhetorical studies based upon the text direct analysis along the lines of chief interest and importance to the student; they are meant to furnish just that element of progressive method without which rhetorical analysis often proves an exercise of doubtful value. The second group of studies is intended to be directive and suggestive only, and not to supply in any manner the place of a text-book of literary theory. It may have the merit at least of bringing home to the student the wide range of questions raised

by literature in its multifarious relations to human life and thought. These questions are forever recurring in literary criticism and discussion, so that a more or less explicit treatment of them becomes necessary in a class of English literature. In this connection Newman's *Literature* will prove helpful to the teacher. Accurate, lucid, and engaging in its presentation of first principles, it offers an excellent starting-point for a course of instruction in literary theory.

The Questions and Studies will be best taken up under the guidance of the instructor, to whom the student will look for an explanation of terms, if explanation be necessary, and especially for a fuller statement of the topics of inquiry than the limits of this edition allow. The editor, it is needless to say, has had no intention of making the Studies do service for a text-book of rhetoric or literary theory. He has accordingly made free use of terms current in the English scientific rhetoric of to-day on the assumption that the student has or should have a knowledge of them from the text-book of rhetoric placed in his hands.

It will not be necessary in the case of every class to cover all the questions and points of study or to take them up in the order given. The instructor who has gauged the mental and literary level of the students before him will know how to select the studies that best answer their needs. A class that has not read Cicero, or perhaps any

Latin at all, can not be expected to compare Newman's style with that of the Roman orator; nor will comparative estimates of the Cardinal's prose and that of other English authors be possible except in the case of authors actually read. Finally, since the edition may be of use to students who are not taking Latin, the Notes are sometimes of a character more in keeping with their needs than with those of students following a classical course.

The editor is indebted to Barry's *Newman* for data embodied in the chronological outline of Newman's life.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
JOHN HENRY CARDINAL NEWMAN, 1801-1890 . . .	xi
TEXT	
Literature	I
NOTES	34
RHETORICAL STUDIES	
A. Structure	43
B. Style	55
a. General Characteristics of Newman's	
Style	55
b. Words	64
c. Sentences	70
d. Paragraphs	74
STUDIES IN LITERARY THEORY	79
a. The Definition of Literature	79
b. Newman's Theory of Literature	83
c. The Function of Literature	88
d. Substance and Form in Literature	93
e. Literature and Art	97
f. Literature and Science	99
g. Literature and Morality	102

JOHN HENRY CARDINAL NEWMAN

1801-1890

- 1801 Born in the city of London, February 21, his parents being John Newman, a banker, and Jemima Foudrinier, who was of Huguenot descent.
- 1808 Attended school at Ealing, near London.
- 1815 Published three periodicals, *The Spy*, *The Anti-Spy*, and *The Beholder*, the last running through forty numbers.
- 1816 Matriculated in December at Trinity College, Oxford.
- 1819 With a friend, Mr. Bowden, brought out *The Undergraduate*, a periodical patterned after Addison's *Spectator*.
- 1821 Made a Fellow of Oriel, April 12. "The turning-point of his life and of all days the most memorable."
- 1824 Ordained in the Anglican Church, June 13, and became Curate of St. Clement's, Oxford, where he remained two years.
- 1825 Appointed Vice-Principal of Alban Hall by his friend, Dr. Whately.
- 1828 Made Vicar of St. Mary's, the University Church, in the pulpit of which he preached his Parochial Sermons. When published "they beat all other sermons out of the market, as Scott's tales beat all other stories."
- 1832 Resigned his tutorship at Oriel and went in De-

ember with Hurrell Froude on a long voyage around the Mediterranean. Wrote on this voyage eighty-five poems in which "the Tractarian Movement . . . sprang forth armed in lyrical strains." This "sea-cycle" includes *Lead, Kindly Light*, written while Newman's ship lay becalmed for a week in the Straits of Bonifacio, near Sicily. Near death's door with fever at Castro Giovanni, he cried out, "I shall not die. I have not sinned against the light!"

- 1833 Returned (July 9) to England, where, as he said, he had a work to do. Five days later, Sunday, July 14, Keble, in his sermon at St. Mary's on "National Apostasy," inaugurated the Oxford Movement, the aim of which was to rid the Anglican Church of state-interference and restore within it the "Church of the Fathers." Newman, as his contribution to the movement, began to issue *Tracts for the Times*.
- 1841 Published Tract 90, a virtual defence of Catholic doctrine. The tract caused a storm and Newman, mildly censured by his Bishop, subsequently retired into lay-communion at Littlemore.
- 1845 Received into the Catholic Church, October 9, by Fr. Dominic, an Italian Passionist.
- 1846 Ordained a priest in Rome.
- 1847 Returned to England with permission from Pius IX to establish there the Oratory of St. Philip Neri.
- 1850 Founded the London Oratory.
- 1852 Preached his best known sermon, *The Second Spring*, July 21, in St. Mary's College, Oscott, on the occasion of the First Provincial Synod of Westminster.
- 1852 Delivered in Dublin nine discourses on University Teaching (first part of *The Idea of a University*).

- 1854 Appointed Rector of the Catholic University in Dublin.
- 1854-1858 Wrote ten "occasional lectures and essays addressed to the members of the Catholic University" (second part of *The Idea of a University*).
- 1858 Retired from the Rectorship of the Catholic University.
- 1864 Wrote the *Apologia pro Vita Sua*, his famous autobiography, which appeared in seven parts between April 21 and June 2.
- 1865 Wrote *The Dream of Gerontius*.
- 1879 Created a Cardinal-deacon by Leo XIII. Chose for his cardinalitial motto a sentence from St. Francis de Sales, "Cor ad cor loquitur" ("Heart speaketh to heart").
- 1890 Died, August 11, at the Oratory, Edgbaston, near Birmingham, England. His epitaph, written by himself, reads, "Ex umbris et imaginibus in veritatem" ("Coming out of shadows into realities").

".....the perfect handling of a theory like Newman's
Idea of a University." Pater: *Style*.

".....the universally accepted masterpiece on that whole subject, *The Idea of a University*, the first reading of which is always an epoch in every university man's life. And that student of letters who has not yet read the lecture on "Literature," and that student of theology who has not yet read the lecture on "Preaching," have both a treat before them that I would envy them were it not that the oftener I read those two lectures I always enjoy them the more. . . . Read attentively the lecture on "Literature" and if you are not simply captivated, you need read no more in Newman."—Whyte: *Newman: An Appreciation*.

LITERATURE

I.

I. WISHING to address you, gentlemen, at the commencement of a new Session, I tried to find a subject for discussion, which might be at once suitable to the occasion, yet neither too large for your time, nor too minute or abstruse for your attention. I think I see one for my purpose in the very title of your Faculty. It is the Faculty of Philosophy and Letters. Now the question may arise as to what is meant by "Philosophy," and what is meant by "Letters." As to the other Faculties, the subject-matter which they profess is intelligible, as soon as named, and beyond all dispute. We know what science is, what medicine, what law, and what theology; but we have not so much ease in determining what is meant by philosophy and letters. Each department of that two-fold province needs explanation: it will be sufficient, on an occasion like this, to investigate one of them. Accordingly, I shall select for remark the latter of

the two, and attempt to determine what we are to understand by letters or literature, in what literature consists, and how it stands relatively to science. We speak, for instance, of ancient and modern literature; the literature of the day, sacred literature, light literature; and our lectures in this place are devoted to classical literature and English literature. Are letters, then, synonymous with books? This cannot be, or they would include in their range philosophy, law, and, in short, the teaching of all the other faculties. Far from confusing these various studies, we view the works of Plato or Cicero sometimes as philosophy, sometimes as literature; on the other hand, no one would ever be tempted to speak of Euclid as literature, or of Matthiae's Greek Grammar. Is, then, literature synonymous with composition? with books written with an attention to style? Is literature fine writing? again, is it studied and artificial writing?

II. There are excellent persons who seem to adopt this last account of Literature as their own idea of it. They depreciate it, as if it were the result of a mere art or trick of words. Professedly, indeed, they are aiming at the Greek and Roman classics, but their criticisms have quite as great force against all literature as against any. I think I shall be best able to bring out what I have to say on the subject by examining the statements which they make in defence of their own view of it.

They contend, then, 1. that fine writing, as exemplified in the Classics, is mainly a matter of conceits, fancies, and prettinesses, decked out in choice words; 2. that this is the proof of it, that the Classics will not bear translating (and this is why I have said that the real attack is upon literature altogether, not the classical only; for, to speak generally, all literature, modern as well as ancient, lies under this disadvantage. This, however, they will not allow; for they maintain); 3, that Holy Scripture presents a remarkable contrast to secular writings on this very point, viz., in that Scripture does easily admit of translation, though it is the most sublime and beautiful of all writings.

2.

III. Now I will begin by stating these three positions in the words of a writer, who is cited by the estimable Catholics in question as a witness, or rather as an advocate, in their behalf, though he is far from being able in his own person to challenge the respect which is inspired by themselves.

IV. "There are two sorts of eloquence," says this writer, "the one indeed scarce deserves the name of it, which consists chiefly in labored and polished periods, an over-curious and artificial arrangement of figures, tinselled over with a gaudy embellishment of words, which glitter, but convey

little or no light to the understanding. This kind of writing is for the most part much affected and admired by the people of weak judgment and vicious taste; but it is a piece of affectation and formality the sacred writers are utter strangers to. It is a vain and boyish eloquence; and, as it has always been esteemed below the great geniuses of all ages, so much more so with respect to those writers who were actuated by the spirit of Infinite Wisdom, and therefore wrote with the force and majesty with which never man writ. The other sort of eloquence is quite the reverse to this, and which may be said to be the true characteristic of the Holy Scriptures; where the excellence does not arise from a labored and far-fetched elocution, but from a surprising mixture of simplicity and majesty, which is a double character, so difficult to be united that it is seldom to be met with in compositions merely human. We see nothing in Holy Writ of affectation and superfluous ornament . . . Now, it is observable that the most excellent profane authors, whether Greek or Latin, lose most of their graces whenever we find them literally translated. Homer's famed representation of Jupiter—his cried-up description of a tempest, his relation of Neptune's shaking the earth and opening it to its centre, his description of Pallas's horses, with numbers of the long-since admired passages, flag, and almost vanish away, in the vulgar Latin translation.

V. "Let any one but take the pains to read the common Latin interpretations of Virgil, Theocritus, or even of Pindar, and one may venture to affirm he will be able to trace out but few remains of the graces which charmed him so much in the original. The natural conclusion from hence is, that in the classical authors, the expression, the sweetness of the numbers, occasioned by a musical placing of words, constitute a great part of their beauties; whereas, in the sacred writings, they consist more in the greatness of the things themselves than in the words and expressions. The ideas and conceptions are so great and lofty in their own nature that they necessarily appear magnificent in the most artless dress. Look but into the Bible, and we see them shine through the most simple and literal translations. That glorious description which Moses gives of the creation of the heavens and the earth, which Longinus . . . was so greatly taken with, has not lost the least whit of its intrinsic worth, and though it has undergone so many translations, yet triumphs over all, and breaks forth with as much force and vehemence as in the original . . . In the history of Joseph, where Joseph makes himself known, and weeps aloud upon the neck of his dear brother Benjamin, that all the house of Pharaoh heard him, at that instant none of his brethren are introduced as uttering aught, either to express their present joy or palliate their former injuries to him. On

all sides there immediately ensues a deep and solemn silence; a silence infinitely more eloquent and expressive than anything else that could have been substituted in its place. Had Thucydides, Herodotus, Livy, or any of the celebrated classical historians, been employed in writing this history, when they came to this point they would doubtless have exhausted all their fund of eloquence in furnishing Joseph's brethren with labored and studied harangues, which, however fine they might have been in themselves, would nevertheless have been unnatural, and altogether improper on the occasion." *

VI. This is eloquently written, but it contains, I consider, a mixture of truth and falsehood, which it will be my business to discriminate from each other. Far be it from me to deny the unapproachable grandeur and simplicity of Holy Scripture; but I shall maintain that the classics are, as human compositions, simple and majestic and natural, too. I grant that Scripture is concerned with things, but I will not grant that classical literature is simply concerned with words. I grant that human literature is often elaborate, but I will maintain that elaborate composition is not unknown to the writers of Scripture. I grant that human literature cannot easily be translated out of the particular language to which it belongs; but it is not at all the rule that Scripture can easily be translated either—and now I address myself to my task:

* Sterne, Sermon XLII.

3.

VII. Here, then, in the first place, I observe, gentlemen, that Literature, from the derivation of the word, implies writing, not speaking; this, however, arises from the circumstance of the copiousness, variety, and public circulation of the matters of which it consists. What is spoken cannot outrun the range of the speaker's voice, and perishes in the uttering. When words are in demand to express a long course of thought, when they have to be conveyed to the ends of the earth, or perpetuated for the benefit of posterity, they must be written down, that is, reduced to the shape of literature; still, properly speaking, the terms by which we denote this characteristic gift of man belong to its exhibition by means of the voice, not of handwriting. It addresses itself, in its primary idea, to the ear, not to the eye. We call it the power of speech, we call it language, that is, the use of the tongue; and even when we write, we still keep in mind what was its original instrument, for we use freely such terms in our books as "saying," "speaking," "telling," "talking," "calling"; we use the term "phraseology" and "diction" as if we were still addressing ourselves to the ear.

VIII. Now I insist on this, because it shows that speech, and therefore literature, which is its permanent record, is essentially a personal work.

It is not some production or result attained by the partnership of several persons, or by machinery, or by any natural process, but in its very idea it proceeds, and must proceed, from some one given individual. Two persons cannot be the authors of the sounds which strike our ear; and, as they cannot be speaking one and the same speech, neither can they be writing one and the same lecture or discourse—which must certainly belong to some one person or other, and is the expression of that one person's ideas and feelings—ideas and feelings personal to himself, though others may have parallel and similar ones—proper to himself, in the same sense as his voice, his air, his countenance, his carriage, and his action are personal. In other words, literature expresses, not objective truth, as it is called, but subjective; not things, but thoughts.

IX. Now this doctrine will become clearer by considering another use of words, which does relate to objective truth, or to things; which relates to matters, not personal, not subjective to the individual, but which, even were there no individual man in the whole world to know them or to talk about them, would exist still. Such objects become the matter of science, and words indeed are used to express them, but such words are rather symbols than language, and however many we use, and however we may perpetuate them by writing, we never could make any kind of literature out of

them, or call them by that name. Such, for instance, would be Euclid's Elements; they relate to truths universal and eternal; they are not mere thoughts, but things; they exist in themselves, not by virtue of our understanding them, not in dependence upon our will, but in what is called the *nature* of things, or at least on conditions external to us. The words, then, in which they are set forth are not language, speech, literature, but rather, as I have said, symbols. And as a proof of it you will recollect that it is possible, nay usual, to set forth the propositions of Euclid in algebraical notation, which, as all would admit, has nothing to do with literature. What is true of mathematics is true also of every study, so far as it is scientific; it makes use of words as the mere vehicle of things, and is thereby withdrawn from the province of literature. Thus metaphysics, ethics, law, political economy, chemistry, theology, cease to be literature in the same degree as they are capable of a severe scientific treatment. And hence it is that Aristotle's works on the one hand, though at first sight literature, approach in character, at least a great number of them, to mere science; for even though the things which he treats of and exhibits may not always be real and true, yet he treats them as if they were, not as if they were the thoughts of his own mind; that is, he treats them scientifically. On the other hand, law or natural history has before now been treated by an author with so much

of coloring derived from his own mind as to become a sort of literature; this is especially seen in the instance of theology, when it takes the shape of pulpit eloquence. It is seen, too, in historical composition, which becomes a mere specimen of chronology, or a chronicle, when divested of the philosophy, the skill, or the party and personal feelings of the particular writer. Science, then, has to do with things, literature with thoughts; science is universal, literature is personal; science uses words merely as symbols, but literature uses language in its full compass, as including phraseology, idiom, style, composition, rhythm, eloquence, and whatever other properties are included in it.

X. Let us then put aside the scientific use of words, when we are to speak of language and literature. Literature is the personal use or exercise of language. That this is so is further proved from the fact that one author uses it so differently from another. Language itself in its very origination would seem to be traceable to individuals. Their peculiarities have given it its character. We are often able, in fact, to trace particular phrases or idioms to individuals; we know the history of their rise. Slang, surely, as it is called, comes of and breathes of the personal. The connection between the force of words in particular languages and the habits and sentiments of the nations speaking them has often been pointed out. And while the many use language as they find it, the man of

genius uses it indeed, but subjects it withal to his own purposes, and molds it according to his own peculiarities. The throng and succession of ideas, thoughts, feelings, imaginations, aspirations, which pass within him, the abstractions, the juxtapositions, the comparisons, the discriminations, the conceptions, which are so original in him, his views of external things, his judgments upon life, manners, and history, the exercise of his wit, of his humor, of his depth, of his sagacity, all these innumerable and incessant creations, the very pulsation and throbbing of his intellect, does he image forth, to all does he give utterance, in a corresponding language, which is as multiform as this inward mental action itself and analogous to it, the faithful expression of his intense personality, attending on his own inward world of thought as its very shadow; so that we might as well say that one man's shadow is another's as that the style of a really gifted mind can belong to any but himself. It follows him about *as* a shadow. His thought and feeling are personal, and so his language is personal.

4.

XI. Thought and speech are inseparable from each other. Matter and expression are parts of one: style is a thinking out into language. This is what I have been laying down, and this is lit-

erature; not *things*, not the verbal symbols of things; not, on the other hand, mere *words*, but thoughts expressed in language. Call to mind, gentlemen, the meaning of the Greek word which expresses this special prerogative of man over the feeble intelligence of the inferior animals. It is called "logos"; what does "logos" mean? It stands both for *reason* and for *speech*, and it is difficult to say which it means more properly. It means both at once: why? because really they cannot be divided—because they are in a true sense one. When we can separate light and illumination, life and motion, the convex and the concave of a curve, then will it be possible for thought to tread speech under foot, and to hope to do without it—then will it be conceivable that the vigorous and fertile intellect should renounce its own double, its instrument of expression, and the channel of its speculations and emotions.

XII. Critics should consider this view of the subject before they lay down such canons of taste as the writer whose pages I have quoted. Such men as he is consider fine writing to be an *addition from without* to the matter treated of—a sort of ornament superinduced, or a luxury indulged in, by those who have time and inclination for such vanities. They speak as if *one* man could do the thought, and *another* the style. We read in Persian travels of the way in which young gentlemen go to work in the East, when they would en-

gage in correspondence with those who inspire them with hope or fear. They cannot write one sentence themselves; so they betake themselves to the professional letter-writer. They confide to him the object they have in view. They have a point to gain from a superior, a favor to ask, an evil to deprecate; they have to approach a man in power, or to make court to some beautiful lady. The professional man manufactures words for them as they are wanted, as a stationer sells them paper, or a schoolmaster might cut their pens. Thought and word are, in their conception, two things, and thus there is a division of labor. The man of thought comes to the man of words; and the man of words, duly instructed in the thought, dips the pen of desire into the ink of devotedness and proceeds to spread it over the page of desolation. Then the nightingale of affection is heard to warble to the rose of loveliness, while the breeze of anxiety plays around the brow of expectation. This is what the Easterns are said to consider fine writing; and it seems pretty much the idea of the school of critics to whom I have been referring.

XIII. We have an instance in literary history of this very proceeding nearer home, in a great university in the latter years of the last century. I have referred to it before now in a public lecture elsewhere;* but it is too much in point here to be

*"Position of Catholics in England," pp. 101, 2.

omitted. A learned Arabic scholar had to deliver a set of lectures before its doctors and professors on an historical subject in which his reading had lain. A linguist is conversant with science rather than with literature; but this gentleman felt that his lectures must not be without a style. He took the step of engaging a person, at a price, to turn the matter which he had got together into ornamental English. Observe he did not wish for mere grammatical English, but for an elaborate, pretentious style. An artist was found in the person of a country curate, and the job was carried out. His lectures remain to this day in their own place in the protracted series of annual discourses to which they belong, distinguished amid a number of heavyish compositions by the rhetorical and ambitious diction for which he went into the market. This learned divine, indeed, and the author I have quoted differ from each other in the estimate they respectively form of literary composition; but they agree together in this—in considering such composition a trick and a trade, they put it on a par with the gold plate, and the flowers, and the music of a banquet, which do not make the viands better, but the entertainment more pleasurable; as if language were the hired servant, the mere mistress of the reason, and not the lawful wife in her own house.

XIV. But can they really think that Homer, or Pindar, or Shakespeare, or Dryden, or Walter

Scott, were accustomed to aim at diction for its own sake, instead of being inspired with their subject, and pouring forth beautiful words because they had beautiful thoughts? this is surely too great a paradox to be borne. Rather, it is the fire within the author's breast which overflows in the torrent of his burning, irresistible eloquence; it is the poetry of his inner soul, which relieves itself in the ode or the elegy; and his mental attitude and bearing, the beauty of his moral countenance, the force and keenness of his logic are imaged in the tenderness, or energy, or richness of his language. Nay, according to the well-known line, "*facit indignatio VERSUS*," not the words alone, but even the rhythm, the metre, the verse, will be the contemporaneous offspring of the emotion or imagination which possesses him. "*Poeta nascitur, non fit*," says the proverb; and this is in numerous instances true of his poems as well as of himself. They are born, not framed; they are a strain rather than a composition; and their perfection is the monument, not so much of his skill as of his power. And this is true of prose as well as of verse in its degree; who will not recognize in the vision of Mirza a delicacy and beauty of style which is very difficult to describe, but which is felt to be in exact correspondence to the ideas of which it is the expression?

5.

XV. And, since the thoughts and reasonings of an author have, as I have said, a personal character, no wonder that his style is not only the image of his subject, but of his mind. That pomp of language, that full and tuneful diction, that felicitousness in the choice and exquisiteness in the collocation of words, which to prosaic writers seems artificial, is nothing else but the mere habit and way of a lofty intellect. Aristotle, in his sketch of the magnanimous man, tells us that his voice is deep, his motions slow, and his stature commanding. In like manner, the elocution of a great intellect is great. His language expresses not only his great thoughts, but his great self. Certainly he might use fewer words than he uses, but he fertilizes his simplest ideas, and germinates into a multitude of details, and prolongs the march of his sentences, and sweeps round to the full diapason of his harmony, as if *νύδει γαίῳ*, rejoicing in his own vigor and richness of resource. I say, a narrow critic will call it verbiage, when really it is a sort of fulness of heart, parallel to that which makes the merry boy whistle as he walks, or the strong man, like the smith in the novel, flourish his club when there is no one to fight with.

XVI. Shakespeare furnishes us with frequent instances of this peculiarity, and all so beautiful

that it is difficult to select for quotation. For instance, in *Macbeth*:

"Canst thou not minister to a mind diseased,
Pluck from the memory a rooted sorrow,
Raze out the written troubles of the brain,
And, with some sweet oblivious antidote,
Cleanse the foul bosom of that perilous stuff,
Which weighs upon the heart?"

Here a simple idea, by a process which belongs to the orator rather than to the poet, but still comes from the native vigor of genius, is expanded into a many-membered period.

The following from *Hamlet* is of the same kind:

"Tis not alone my inky cloak, good mother,
Nor customary suits of solemn black,
Nor windy suspiration of forced breath,
No, nor the fruitful river in the eye,
Nor the dejected haviour of the visage,
Together with all forms, modes, shows of grief,
That can denote me truly."

XVII. Now if such declamation, for declamation it is, however noble, be allowable in a poet, whose genius is so far removed from pompousness or pretence, much more is it allowable in an orator, whose very province it is to put forth words to the best advantage he can. Cicero has nothing more redundant in any part of his writings than these passages from Shakespeare. No lover, then, at least of Shakespeare, may fairly accuse Cicero of

gorgeousness of phrasology or diffuseness of style. Nor will any sound critic be tempted to do so. As a certain unaffected neatness and propriety and grace of diction may be required of any author who lays claim to be a classic, for the same reason that a certain attention to dress is expected of every gentleman, so to Cicero may be allowed the privilege of the "*os magna sonaturum*," of which the ancient critic speaks. His copious, majestic, musical flow of language, even if sometimes beyond what the subject-matter demands, is never out of keeping with the occasion or with the speaker. It is the expression of lofty sentiments in lofty sentences, the "*mens magna in corpore magno*." It is the development of the inner man. Cicero vividly realized the *status* of a Roman senator and statesman, and the "pride of place" of Rome, in all the grace and grandeur which attached to her; and he imbibed and became what he admired. As the exploits of Scipio or Pompey are the expression of this greatness in deed, so the language of Cicero is the expression of it in word. And as the acts of the Roman ruler or soldier represent to us in a manner special to themselves the characteristic magnanimity of the lords of the earth, so do the speeches or treatises of her accomplished orator bring it home to our imaginations as no other writing could do. Neither Livy, nor Tacitus, nor Terence, nor Seneca, nor Pliny, nor Quintilian is an adequate spokesman

for the Imperial City. They write Latin, Cicero writes Roman.

6.

XVIII. You will say that Cicero's language is undeniably studied, but that Shakespeare's is as undeniably natural and spontaneous, and that this is, what is meant when the classics are accused of being mere artists of words. Here we are introduced to a further large question, which gives me the opportunity of anticipating a misapprehension of my meaning. I observe, then, that not only is that lavish richness of style which I have noticed in Shakespeare justifiable on the principles which I have been laying down, but, what is less easy to receive, even elaborateness in composition is no mark of trick or artifice in an author. Undoubtedly the works of the classics, particularly the Latin, *are* elaborate; they have cost a great deal of time, care, and trouble. They have had many rough copies, I grant it. I grant also that there are writers, ancient and modern, who really are guilty of the absurdity of making sentences as the very end of their literary labor. Such was Isocrates; such were some of the sophists; they were set on words, to the neglect of thoughts or things; I cannot defend them. If I must give an English instance of this fault, much as I love and revere the personal character and intellectual vigor of Dr.

Johnson, I cannot deny that his style often outruns the sense and the occasion and is wanting in that simplicity which is the attribute of genius. Still, granting all this, I cannot grant, notwithstanding, that genius never need take pains—that genius may not improve by practice; that it never incurs failures and succeeds the second time; that it never finishes off at leisure what it has thrown off in the outline at a stroke.

XIX. Take the instance of the painter or the sculptor: he has a conception in his mind which he wishes to represent in the medium of his art—the Madonna and Child, or Innocence, or Fortitude, or some historical character or event. Do you mean to say he does not study his subject? does he not make sketches? does he not even call them “studies”? does he not call his workroom a *studio*? is he not ever designing, rejecting, adopting, correcting, perfecting? Are not the first attempts of Michael Angelo and Raffaello extant, in the case of some of their most celebrated compositions? Will any one say that the Apollo Belvidere is not a conception patiently elaborated into its proper perfection? These departments of taste are, according to the received notions of the world, the very province of genius, and yet we call them *arts*; they are the “Fine Arts.” Why may not that be true of literary composition which is true of painting, sculpture, architecture, and music? Why may not language be wrought as well as colors? Why

should not skill in diction be simply subservient and instrumental to the great prototypal ideas which are the contemplation of a Plato or a Virgil? Our greatest poet tells us,

“The poet’s eye, in a fine frenzy rolling,
Doth glance from heaven to earth, from earth to heaven,
And, as imagination bodies forth
The forms of things unknown, the poet’s pen
Turns them to shapes, and gives to airy nothing
A local habitation and a name.”

Now, is it wonderful that that pen of his should sometimes be at fault for a while—that it should pause, write, erase, rewrite, amend, complete, before he satisfies himself that his language has done justice to the conceptions which his mind’s eye contemplated?

XX. In this point of view, doubtless, many or most writers are elaborate; and those certainly not the least whose style is furthest removed from ornament, being simple and natural, or vehement, or severely business-like and practical. Who so energetic and manly as Demosthenes? Yet he is said to have transcribed Thucydides many times over in the formation of his style. Who so gracefully natural as Herodotus? Yet his very dialect is not his own, but chosen for the sake of the perfection of his narrative. Who exhibits such happy negligence as our own Addison? Yet artistic fastidiousness was so notorious in his instance that the report has got abroad, truly or not, that he

was too late in his issue of an important state-paper, from his habit of revision and recomposition. Such great authors were working by a model which was before the eyes of their intellect, and they were laboring to say what they had to say in such a way as would most exactly and suitably express it. It is not wonderful that other authors, whose style is not simple, should be instances of a similar literary diligence. Virgil wished his *Æneid* to be burned, elaborate as is its composition, because he felt it needed more labor still in order to make it perfect. The historian Gibbon, in the last century, is another instance in point. You must not suppose I am going to recommend his style for imitation any more than his principles, but I refer to him as the example of a writer feeling the task which lay before him, feeling that he had to bring out into words for the comprehension of his readers a great and complicated scene, and wishing that those words should be adequate to his undertaking. I think he wrote the first chapter of his history three times over; it was not that he corrected or improved the first copy, but he put his first essay and then his second aside—he recast his matter till he had hit the precise exhibition of it which he thought demanded by his subject.

XXI. Now in all these instances I wish to observe that what I have admitted about literary workmanship differs from the doctrine which I am opposing in this: that the mere dealer in words

cares little or nothing for the subject which he is embellishing, but can paint and gild anything whatever to order; whereas the artist, whom I am acknowledging, has his great or rich visions before him and his only aim is to bring out what he thinks or what he feels in a way adequate to the thing spoken of and appropriate to the speaker.

7.

XXII. The illustration which I have been borrowing from the fine arts will enable me to go a step further. I have been showing the connection of the thought with the language in literary composition, and in doing so I have exposed the unphilosophical notion that the language was an extra which could be dispensed with and provided to order, according to the demand. But I have not yet brought out what immediately follows from this, and which was the second point I had to show, viz., that to be capable of easy translation is no test of the excellence of a composition. If I must say what I think, I should lay down with little hesitation that the truth was almost the reverse of this doctrine. Nor are many words required to show it. Such a doctrine, as is contained in the passage of the author whom I quoted when I began, goes upon the assumption that one language is just like another language—that every language

has all the ideas, turns of thought, delicacies of expression, figures, associations, abstractions, points of view, which every other language has. Now, as far as regards science, it is true that all languages are pretty much alike for the purposes of science; but even in this respect some are more suitable than others, which have to coin words, or to borrow them, in order to express scientific ideas. But if languages are not all equally adapted even to furnish symbols for those universal and eternal truths in which science consists, how can they reasonably be expected to be all equally rich, equally forcible, equally musical, equally exact, equally happy in expressing the idiosyncratic peculiarities of thought of some original and fertile mind who has availed himself of one of them? A great author takes his native language, masters it, partly throws himself into it, partly molds and adapts it, and pours out his multitude of ideas through the variously ramified and delicately minute channels of expression which he has found and framed—does it follow that this, his personal presence (as it may be called), can forthwith be transferred to every other language under the sun? Then may we reasonably maintain that Beethoven's *piano* music is not really beautiful because it cannot be played on the hurdy-gurdy? Were not this astonishing doctrine maintained by persons far superior to the writer whom I have selected for animadversion, I should find it difficult to be patient

under a gratuitous extravagance. It seems that a really great author must admit of translation, and that we have a test of his excellence when he reads to advantage in a foreign language as well as in his own. Then Shakespeare *is* a genius because he can be translated into German, and *not* a genius because he cannot be translated into French. Then the multiplication-table is the most gifted of all conceivable compositions, because it loses nothing by translation, and can hardly be said to belong to any one language whatever. Whereas I should rather have conceived that, in proportion as ideas are novel and recondite, they would be difficult to put into words, and that the very fact of their having insinuated themselves into one language would diminish the chance of that happy accident being repeated in another. In the language of savages you can hardly express any idea or act of the intellect at all: is the tongue of the Hottentot or Esquimaux to be made the measure of the genius of Plato, Pindar, Tacitus, St. Jerome, Dante, or Cervantes?

XXIII. Let us recur, I say, to the illustration of the fine arts. I suppose you can express ideas in painting which you cannot express in sculpture; and the more an artist is of a painter the less he is likely to be of a sculptor. The more he commits his genius to the methods and conditions of his own art the less he will be able to throw himself into the circumstances of another. Is the genius of

Fra Angelo, of Francia, or of Raffaello disparaged by the fact that he was able to do that in colors which no man that ever lived, which no Angel, could achieve in wood? Each of the fine arts has its own subject-matter; from the nature of the case you can do in one what you cannot do in another; you can do in painting what you cannot do in carving; you can do in oils what you cannot do in fresco; you can do in marble what you cannot do in ivory; you can do in wax what you cannot do in bronze. Then, I repeat, applying this to the case of languages, why should not genius be able to do in Greek what it cannot do in Latin? and why are its Greek and Latin works defective because they will not turn into English? That genius of which we are speaking did not make English; it did not make all languages, present, past, and future; it did not make the laws of *any* language: why is it to be judged of by that in which it had no part, over which it has no control?

8.

XXIV. And now we are naturally brought on to our third point, which is on the characteristics of Holy Scripture as compared with profane literature. Hitherto we have been concerned with the doctrine of these writers, viz., that style is an *extrad*, that it is a mere artifice, and that hence it

cannot be translated; now we come to their fact, viz., that Scripture has no such artificial style, and that Scripture can easily be translated. Surely their fact is as untenable as their doctrine.

XXV. Scripture easy of translation! then why have there been so few good translators? why is it that there has been such great difficulty in combining the two necessary qualities, fidelity to the original and purity in the adopted vernacular? why is it that the authorized versions of the Church are often so inferior to the original as compositions, except that the Church is bound above all things to see that the version is doctrinally correct, and in a difficult problem is obliged to put up with defects in what is of secondary importance, provided she secure what is of first? If it were so easy to transfer the beauty of the original to the copy, she would not have been content with her received version in various languages which could be named.

XXVI. And then in the next place, Scripture not elaborate! Scripture not ornamented in diction, and musical in cadence! Why, consider the Epistle to the Hebrews—where is there in the classics any composition more carefully, more artificially written? Consider the book of Job—is it not a sacred drama, as artistic, as perfect as any Greek tragedy of Sophocles or Euripides? Consider the Psalter—are there no ornaments, no rhythm, no studied cadences, no responsive members in that divinely beautiful book? And is it not hard to

understand? are not the prophets hard to understand? is not St. Paul hard to understand? Who can say that these are popular compositions? who can say that they are level at first reading with the understandings of the multitude?

XXVII. That there are portions indeed of the inspired volume more simple both in style and in meaning, and that these are the more sacred and sublime passages, as, for instance, parts of the Gospel, I grant at once; but this does not militate against the doctrine I have been laying down. Recollect, gentlemen, my distinction when I began. I have said literature is one thing and that science is another; that literature has to do with ideas and science with realities; that literature is of a personal character, that science treats of what is universal and eternal. In proportion then as Scripture excludes the personal coloring of its writers and rises into the region of pure and mere inspiration, when it ceases in any sense to be the writing of man, of St. Paul, or St. John, or Moses, or Isaias, then it comes to belong to science, not literature; then it conveys the things of heaven, unseen verities, divine manifestations, and them alone—not the ideas, the feelings, the aspirations of its human instruments, who, for all that they were inspired and infallible, did not cease to be men. St. Paul's epistles, then, I consider to be literature in a real and true sense, *as* personal, *as* rich in reflection as Demosthenes or Euripides; and without

ceasing to be revelations of objective truth, they are expressions of the subjective notwithstanding. On the other hand, portions of the Gospels, of the book of Genesis, and other passages of the Sacred Volume are of the nature of science. Such is the beginning of St. John's Gospel, which we read at the end of Mass. Such is the Creed. I mean passages such as these are the mere enunciation of eternal things, without, so to say, the medium of any human mind transmitting them to us. The words used have the grandeur, the majesty, the calm unimpassioned beauty of science; they are in no sense literature, they are in no sense personal, and therefore they are easy to apprehend and easy to translate.

XXVIII. Did time admit I could show you parallel instances of what I am speaking of in the classics, inferior to the inspired word in proportion as the subject-matter of the classical authors is immensely inferior to the subjects treated of in Scripture—but parallel inasmuch as the classical author or speaker ceases for the moment to have to do with literature, as speaking of things objectively, and rises to the serene sublimity of science. But I should be carried too far if I began.

9.

XXIX. I shall, then, merely sum up what I have said and come to a conclusion. Reverting,

then, to my original question, what is the meaning of letters, as contained, gentlemen, in the designation of your faculty, I have answered, that by letters or literature is meant the expression of thought in language, where by "thought" I mean the ideas, feelings, views, reasonings, and other operations of the human mind. And the art of letters is the method by which a speaker or writer brings out in words worthy of his subject and sufficient for his audience or readers, the thoughts which impress him. Literature, then, is of a personal character; it consists in the enunciations and teachings of those who have a right to speak as representatives of their kind, and in whose words their brethren find an interpretation of their own sentiments, a record of their own experience, and a suggestion for their judgments. A great author, gentlemen, is not one who merely has a *copia verborum*, whether in prose or verse, and can, as it were, turn on at his will any number of splendid phrases and swelling sentences; but he is one who has something to say and knows how to say it. I do not claim for him, as such, any great depth of thought, or breadth of view, or philosophy, or sagacity, or knowledge of human nature, or experience of human life, though these additional gifts he may have, and the more he has of them the greater he is; but I ascribe to him, as his characteristic gift in a large sense, the faculty of Expression. He is master of the twofold Logos, the thought and the

word, distinct but inseparable from each other. He may, if so be, elaborate his compositions, or he may pour out his improvisations, but in either case he has but one aim, which he keeps steadily before him, and is conscientious and single-minded in fulfilling. That aim is to give forth what he has within him; and from his very earnestness it comes to pass that, whatever be the splendor of his diction, or the harmony of his periods, he has with him the charm of an incommunicable simplicity. Whatever be his subject, high or low, he treats it suitably and for its own sake. If he is a poet, "*nil molitur ineptè*." If he is an orator, then, too, he speaks not only "*dictinctè*" and "*splendidè*," but also "*aptè*." His page is the lucid mirror of his mind and life—

"Quo fit, ut omnis
Votivâ pateat veluti descripta tabellâ
Vita senis."

He writes passionately because he feels keenly; forcibly because he conceives vividly; he sees too clearly to be vague; he is too serious to be otiose; he can analyze his subject, and therefore he is rich; he embraces it as a whole and in its parts, and therefore he is consistent; he has a firm hold of it, and therefore he is luminous. When his imagination wells up it overflows in ornament; when his heart is touched it thrills along his verse. He always has the right word for the right idea,

and never a word too much. If he is brief, it is because few words suffice; when he is lavish of them still each word has its mark, and aids, not embarrasses, the vigorous march of his elocution. He expresses what all feel but all cannot say; and his sayings pass into proverbs among his people, and his phrases become household words and idioms of their daily speech, which is tessellated with the rich fragments of his language, as we see in foreign lands the marbles of Roman grandeur worked into the walls and pavements of modern palaces.

XXX. Such preëminently is Shakespeare among ourselves; such preëminently Virgil among the Latins; such in their degree are all those writers who in every nation go by the name of classics. To particular nations they are necessarily attached from the circumstance of the variety of tongues and the peculiarities of each; but, so far, they have a catholic and ecumenical character, that what they express is common to the whole race of man, and they alone are able to express it.

10.

XXXI. If, then, the power of speech is a gift as great as any that can be named; if the origin of language is by many philosophers even considered to be nothing short of divine; if by means of

words the secrets of the heart are brought to light, pain of soul is relieved, hidden grief is carried off, sympathy conveyed, counsel imparted, experience recorded, and wisdom perpetuated; if by great authors the many are drawn up into unity, national character is fixed, a people speaks, the past and the future, the East and the West are brought into communication with each other; if such men are, in a word, the spokesmen and prophets of the human family,—it will not answer to make light of literature or to neglect its study; rather we may be sure that, in proportion as we master it in whatever language and imbibe its spirit, we shall ourselves become in our own measure the ministers of like benefits to others, be they many or few, be they in the obscurer or the more distinguished walks of life, who are united to us by social ties and are within the sphere of our personal influence.

NOTES

Newman's *Literature* forms a part of his well-known volume, *The Idea of a University*, the full title of which is, *The Idea of a University Defined and Illustrated: I, In nine Discourses delivered to the Catholics of Dublin; II, In occasional Lectures and Essays addressed to the Members of the Catholic University by John Henry Cardinal Newman*. The Lecture fills pages 268-294 of Longman's edition of the work and is entered in the Table of Contents thus: *Literature. A Lecture read in the School of Philosophy and Letters. November, 1858*. It was written by Newman while he was Rector of the Catholic University of Ireland, an institution which closed its doors in 1858 after a brief and somewhat struggling existence. As its aim is expository, it may be regarded, at least for purposes of study, as a specimen of the didactic essay. Apart from the fact of its being a production to be read or delivered before an audience, the lecture, as a literary type, does not differ essentially from the essay, which is the characteristic type of expository writing. Of course, the lecture requires a more uniformly direct and animated manner than the simple essay, a circumstance which the student will not lose sight of in weighing the stylistic qualities of Newman's *Literature*.

1. **Plato** (429 or 427-347 B. C.). A celebrated Greek philosopher, founder of the Academy. He was a pupil of Socrates and the teacher of Aristotle.

Cicero, Marcus Tullius (106-43 B. C.). The most famous of Roman orators and according to Newman "the greatest master of composition that the world has ever seen."

Euclid. A Greek geometrician who flourished about 300 B. C.

2. **There are excellent persons, etc.** Probably an echo on the English side of the Channel of the controversy carried on in France by Abbé Gaume and others against the use of the ancient classics in education.

They contend, then, etc. A curiously involved and almost clumsy grouping of sentences; but the sense is perfectly clear.

3. **In the words of a writer, etc.** Laurence Sterne (1713-1768), English novelist and humorist, was a clergyman of the Anglican Church.

4. **Homer's famed representation of Jupiter** (*Iliad* I, 528-531), his cried-up description of a tempest (*Odyssey* V, 280, etc.), his relation of Neptune's shaking the earth and opening it to its centre (*Iliad* XX, 57), his description of Pallas's horses (*Iliad* VIII, 375, etc.).

5. **Virgil** (L. Publius Virgilius Maro, 70-19 B. C.). The prince of Latin poets, "wielder of the stateliest measure ever moulded by the lips of man."

Theocritus, a Sicilian of the 3d century B. C. The foremost of the Greek idyllic poets.

Pindar (522-443 B. C.). A celebrated Greek lyric poet; author of the *Epinicia* or *Odes of Victory*, "the triumphal song of Hellenism," written to commemorate the victors in the Olympian games.

Moses. The divinely appointed law-giver of the Hebrews whom he organized into a nation. The account of creation is in Genesis I.

Longinus, Dionysius Cassius (210[?]-273). A Greek critic and philosopher, reputed author of the essay "*On the Sublime*," a valuable piece of literary criticism.

The history of Joseph. Genesis XLV.

Thucydides (471[?]-401 B. C.). A celebrated Athenian historian, whose account of the Peloponnesian War is one of the glories of Greek literature.

Herodotus (484[?]-424[?] B. C.). Greek historian, surnamed the "Father of History," author of a history in nine books of the Persian invasion of Greece.

Livy (Titus Livius, 59 B. C.-17 A. D.). The great Roman historian, author of a History of Rome, a work noted for its picturesque and vivid narrative.

7. Here, then, in the first place, etc. Do you follow the reasoning of this and the next paragraph? Paraphrase briefly.

8. Now I insist on this, because it shows, etc. Note the inference which Newman here draws from the preceding paragraph. Is the inference a valid one?

9. **Aristotle** (384-322 B. C.). The founder of the Peripatetic School and the most influential of Greek philosophers.

10. **The throng and succession of ideas, etc.** A good illustration of Newman's method of enlarging on a simple theme by a quick and copious accumulation of kindred ideas. The theme here may be said to be Buffon's conception of style, "The style is the man himself."

11. **Thought and speech are inseparable from each other.** The author is scarcely to be understood in the sense that no ideas, even the most rudimentary, are possible without a corresponding framework of words. The idea precedes the word and, as in the case of children and mutes, can exist without any verbal sign whatever. It is true, however, that close, sustained thinking is virtually impossible without language. What Newman wishes to emphasize here is the all-important fact that in the concrete literary product

thought and language do not stand apart but coalesce in a subtle, mysterious union. This same fact is also insisted upon by De Quincey. "There arises a case entirely different where style cannot be regarded as a *dress* or alien covering, but where style becomes the *incarnation* of the thoughts. The human body is not the dress or apparel of the human spirit; far more mysterious is the mode of their union. Call the two elements A and B; then it is impossible to point out A as existing aloof from B and vice versa. A exists in and through B; B exists in and through A." (De Quincey; *Language*, p. 214. De Quincey's *Essays on Style, Rhetoric and Language*, ed. by F. N. Scott.)

12. The man of thought, etc. A bit of burlesque. What did Newman understand by "fine writing"? What do we ordinarily understand by it?

14. Homer, the reputed author of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. According to Herodotus he lived about 850 B. C.

William Shakespeare (1564-1616). The greatest of dramatists and chief glory of English literature.

John Dryden (1631-1700). English Catholic poet and dramatist of high rank.

Walter Scott (1771-1832). Scottish poet and novelist; author of the *Waverly Novels*, the greatest contribution ever made to English romantic fiction.

Facit indignatio versus. Juvenal: *Satires*, I. "Indignation makes (inspires) verses."

Poeta nascitur, non fit. "A poet is born, not made."

The vision of Mirza. An Oriental allegorical tale in Addison's *Spectator*, No. 159.

15. His style is not only the image, etc. The words "not only" seem to be misplaced. Attend, however, to Prof. F. N. Scott's comment on a parallel instance in Webster. "In the placing of words and phrases Webster is so uniformly accurate that if, now and then,

he transgresses a precept of the text-books, the reader may well raise the question whether the precept is not at fault rather than the author. For example, there is a rule in most rhetorics that the word 'only' should immediately precede the word it modifies. The rule is obviously violated in such sentences as the following: But it is the rule which is at fault, not Webster. The usage of good writers is to place 'only' immediately before the word it modifies whenever another position would cause ambiguity; in other cases its position is determined largely by the demands of rhythm" (*Webster's First Bunker Hill Oration and Washington's Farewell Address*, ed. by F. N. Scott).

Aristotle . . . the magnanimous man, etc. The *Nicomachean Ethics*, Book IV, chap. IX.

κῦδεῖ γαλῶν. Homer: *Iliad*, I, 405. "Exulting in glory."

16. **Macbeth**. Act V, sc. 3.

Hamlet. Act I, sc. 2.

17. **Os magna sonaturum**. Horace: *Satires*, I, 4, 43. "The tongue that is to utter noble things." (Lonsdale and Lee.)

Mens magna in corpore magno. A great mind in a large body.

Scipio. The family name of several distinguished Roman generals, the most famous of whom were Scipio Aemilianus (185[?]-129 B. C.) and Scipio Africanus (234[?]-183 [?] B. C.).

Pompey (Cneius Pompeius Magnus, 106-48 B. C.). Caesar's chief rival for supremacy in the Roman state; defeated by Caesar at Pharsalia, 48 B. C.

Tacitus, Cornelius (55[?]-117[?]). Roman historian noted for the abrupt vigor and conciseness of his style.

Terence (193[?]-155 B. C.). Publius Terentius Afer, a Roman comic poet.

Seneca, Lucius Annaeus (4[?] B. C.-65 A. D.). A Roman philosopher of the Stoic School.

Pliny (Plinius). Pliny "the Elder" (23-79) and his nephew Pliny "the Younger" (62-113) were Roman authors of note.

Quintilian. (Marcus Fabius Quintilianus, 35-95). Celebrated Roman rhetorician; author of a treatise, "*Institutio Oratoria*," which is still valuable.

Cicero writes Roman. See Newman's essay on Cicero in *Historical Sketches*, Vol. I, 245. His acknowledgment of the debt he owed to the great Latin stylist is well known. "As to patterns for imitation," he wrote in 1869 when he was sixty-eight years old, "the only master of style I have ever had (which is strange, considering the differences of the languages) is Cicero. I think I owe a great deal to him and as far as I know to no one else" (*Letters and Correspondence*, II, 427).

18. Newman maintains that Shakespeare's lavish richness of style is justified on the principles he has been laying down. What are those principles and how do they affect the question of Shakespeare's style?

Isocrates (436-338 B. C.). One of the ten Attic orators and a noted teacher of eloquence.

Sophists. A class of teachers of philosophy in ancient Greece notorious for their dialectical trickery.

Dr. Samuel Johnson (1709-1784). English lexicographer and essayist, whose fame rests largely on his biography written by Boswell.

19. **Michael Angelo**, (1475-1564). Most distinguished of Renaissance artists. He was sculptor, painter, architect, and poet.

Raffaello, or Raphael, of Urbino (1485-1520). One of the masters of Italian Renaissance art.

Apollo Belvidere (or **Belvedere**). A statue of ancient workmanship in the Vatican, Rome.

The poet's eye in a fine frenzy rolling, etc. *Midsummer-Night's Dream*, Act. V, sc. 1.

20. Demosthenes (384 or 385-322 B. C.). The foremost of the Greek orators.

Joseph Addison (1672-1719). His essays in the "Spectator" are recognized models of pure and graceful English prose. Secretary of state for one year under George I.

Such great authors were working by a model, etc. That success in composition is largely a matter of studying and imitating the recognized masters of style was a favorite viewpoint of Newman's. (See *Idea of a University*, p. 322.) The problem of literary imitation comes to this,—how to catch the various arts and devices of composition from the model under study without sacrifice of one's individuality. On the practice of literary imitation see also Stevenson: *A College Magazine in Memories and Portraits*, p. 57.

Edward Gibbon (1737-1794). English historian, author of *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*.

22. Ludwig van Beethoven (1770-1827). A musical composer of the first rank. Born at Bonn in Prussia, he spent the greater part of his life in Vienna.

Then Shakespeare is a genius, etc. A capital *reductio ad absurdum*.

St. Jerome (345[?]-420). Perhaps the most learned of the Latin Fathers. His translation, known as the Vulgate, of the Scriptures into Latin is the official version of the sacred writings in the Catholic Church.

Dante Aligheri (1265-1321). The chief glory of Italian literature; author of the "Divina Commedia," one of the world's great epics.

Miguel de Cervantes (1547-1616). The most celebrated of Spanish novelists, chiefly through his masterpiece, *Don Quixote*.

23. Fra Angelico (Giovanni Angelico da Fiesole, 1387-1455). An Italian painter of the Dominican order, famous for his treatment of religious subjects.

Francia (Francesco Raibolini, 1450-1518). Italian painter associated with Raphael.

25. Why have there been so few good translators? One is reminded here that Cardinal Newman was once on the point of undertaking a revision of the Douay or English Catholic version of the Bible.

26. Sophocles (495 or 496-406 B. C.). One of the celebrated trio of Greek dramatists, Æschylus, Euripides, and Sophocles.

Euripides (480-406 B. C.). Greek dramatist.

29. The faculty of Expression. See Newman's *Essay on Poetry* (Cook's edition), p. 27, for the idea that "a talent for composition" is indispensable to the poet.

Copia verborum. "A wide vocabulary, fluency."

Nil molitur inepte. Horace: *Ars Poetica*, 140. "He is never inept."

Apte. "To the point."

Quo fit ut omnis, etc. Horace: *Satires*, II, 1, 33. "So that all the life of the old poet is open to our view as though painted on votive tablets." (Lonsdale and Lee.)

He writes passionately, etc. Newman's superb characterization of a great writer fits no one better than himself.

31. A people speaks, etc. That literature is a vehicle of national and social expression, "the voice of a particular nation" is a theme enlarged upon in *The Idea of a University*, p. 307 et seq. See also *Id.*, pp. 227-232. "Man is a being of genius, passion, intellect.

conscience, power. He exercises these various gifts in various ways: in great deeds, in great thoughts, in heroic acts, in hateful crimes. He founds states, he fights battles, he builds cities, he ploughs the forest, he subdues the elements, he rules his kind. He creates vast ideas and influences many generations. He takes a thousand shapes and undergoes a thousand fortunes. Literature records them all to the life,
*Quicquid agunt homines, votum, timor, ira, voluptas,
Gaudia, discursus."*

RHETORICAL STUDIES

A. STRUCTURE

For the student of composition the problem of structure is perhaps a more practical one than that of style. The secrets of an effective style cannot easily be communicated; they involve too much of the merely personal and temperamental to admit of precise and intelligible statement. We may feel the beauty of a lyric or a bit of prose, but we cannot often determine with any degree of confidence the precise technical processes, if any, to which the beauty of the lyric or the bit of prose is due. But it is otherwise with the element of structure. Here we have an element, organic, it is true, to the literary product, yet capable, as the scientists say, of isolation, and open to very searching and complete examination. It is a matter of no great difficulty, for example, to lay bare the framework of an essay, to investigate the size, functions and relations of the various parts and determine the suitability of the framework to the body of thought and statement it is meant to support.

The question of structure being at bottom one of order, regularity, method in the presentation of material is often a disagreeable one for the student of composition. To no discipline is the undeveloped mind more recalcitrant than to the discipline of orderly, coherent thinking. Young people will sometimes find the putting of their thoughts on paper a process of sheer delight; but to be told first to order their thoughts into a clear-cut and consistent plan is likely to cause them a sinking of the heart. Yet the principles, the technique of structure, must be mastered by the student sooner or later, and, what is important to note, they can be mastered and applied by him without detriment to freshness and spontaneity of expression.

It is in this connection that Newman's literary methods are particularly instructive. His cast of mind was unique in its union of profound sensibility with the severest logic. He was a poet, but he was also a close and careful thinker. Hence, clearness, sequence, orderly arrangement, adequacy of treatment characterize his writings; in a word, they are strong in all the elements that enter into the notion of rhetorical structure. As a matter of fact, constructive excellence is not always found even in our English classics. Thus Lamb's *Essays of Elia* and Thackeray's *Roundabout Papers*, for all their literary quality, are weak structurally. They represent, however, a type, and a legitimate

type, of pure literature. But it would be fatal for the student to imagine that productions of this type realize all the possibilities in the effective presentment of material, or that all subjects can be safely dealt with in the same loose, discursive fashion.

There are different methods of exhibiting the plan or structure of an essay. Some are more detailed and complete than others, but all serve some practical need and may be used on occasion. The topical abstract, paragraph summary, and tabular analysis will alone be applied here.

I. The Topical Abstract. This simplest form of outline names the more important ideas of the essay in topical form, somewhat after the manner of a table of contents.

- I. False views on the subject of Literature.
- II. Sterne's summary of these views.
- III. Literature essentially a personal work.
- IV. Thought and speech inseparable from each other.
- V. Style the image of an author's mind.
- VI. Great authors elaborate in their compositions.
- VII. Capability of easy translation no test of literary excellence.
- VIII. Holy Scripture elaborate and not easy to translate.
- IX. Faculty of expression the characteristic gift of a great author.
- X. Importance of Literature.

II. **The Paragraph Summary.** This method of abridgment assembles all the leading ideas of the essay, expressing them in full sentence-form, but without indicating their logical or structural relations or their comparative value. The making of a paragraph-summary is therefore simply the process of finding the topic-sentence of the successive paragraphs, care being taken to preserve, as far as possible, the author's own language.

I. The Lecture attempts to determine the meaning of Literature and its relation to Science.

II. There are persons who consider that literature is studied and artificial writing.

III. The views of these persons will be stated in the words of Sterne.

IV. According to this author there are two sorts of eloquence, the one artificial and affected, the other simple and majestic, as in Holy Writ.

V. Again, according to him, the beauties of the ancient classics are chiefly those of words and expressions; the beauties of Holy Writ chiefly those of ideas and things.

VI. Sterne's remarks contain a mixture of truth and falsehood.

VII. Although literature, from the derivation of the word, implies writing, not speaking, still, in its primary idea, it addresses itself to the ear and not to the eye.

VIII. Hence it follows that literature is essentially a personal work.

IX. Science, which has to do with things, uses words as mere symbols and is not personal, but universal.

X. That literature is the personal use of language is further proved from the fact that one author uses it differently from another.

XI. Thought and speech are inseparable from each other.

XII. Failure to consider this truth has led some critics to consider style to be an addition from without.

XIII. The view of these critics may be illustrated by the instance of the learned Arabic professor who had his lectures worked over by a country curate in an elaborate, pretentious style.

XIV. Great writers do not aim at diction for its own sake, but pour forth beautiful words because they have beautiful thoughts.

XV. The style of an author is the image not only of his subject but of his mind.

XVI. Shakespeare furnishes us with frequent instances of this truth.

XVII. A copious, majestic diction is allowable in an orator as well as in a poet, a truth we see exemplified in Cicero.

XVIII. Even elaborateness of composition is no mark of trick or artifice in an author.

XIX. This is shown by the analogy of the fine arts.

XX. Many or most writers are elaborate in the sense of painstaking.

XXI. While, therefore, the mere dealer in words cares little or nothing for his subject, the artist in his concern for his subject is led to aim at appropriate expression.

XXII. To be capable of easy translation is no test of the excellence of a composition.

XXIII. Just as a given idea may be expressed better in one fine art than in another, so may it be better expressed in one language than in another.

XXIV. That Scripture is not artificial in style and can easily be translated are untenable facts.

XXV. That Scripture is not easy of translation is proved by the rarity of good translations.

XXVI. Scripture is both elaborate in style and hard to understand.

XXVII. Between certain portions of Scripture and others there exists the same distinction as between literature and science.

XXVIII. Parallel instances of the foregoing distinction may be found also in the classics.

XXIX. Literature, therefore, as the expression of thought in language, is of a personal character, and the characteristic gift of a great author is the faculty of expression.

XXX. Classic writers express what is common to the whole race of man, and they alone are able to express it.

XXXI. It will not, therefore, answer to make light of literature or to neglect its study.

III. The Tabular Analysis. This is the surest method of indicating to the eye the contents of an essay. It not only shows all the leading ideas and considerations, but also exhibits in clear diagrammatic form their precise logical and structural bearings. Introduction and conclusion, being mere appendages to the plan and not organic parts of the same, are not here included in the tabular analysis. The substance of the introductory paragraphs (1-6) and of the concluding ones (29-31) can easily be summarized by the student.

I. Literature is not simply concerned with words. (§§ 7-21.)

A. Literature is the personal use or exercise of language. (§§ 7-10.)

a. Literature is the permanent record of speech, which is essentially personal.

b. Two persons cannot write one and the same composition any more than they can be authors of the same sound that strikes our ears.

c. While science deals with objective truths, "things," literature deals with subjective truths, "thoughts."

d. Science, unlike literature, uses words merely as symbols.

e. One author uses language differently from another, *i. e.*, his thought and feeling are personal and hence his language is personal.

B. Thought and speech are inseparable. (§§ 11-14.)

a. Style is a thinking out into language.

b. The view that style is a mere addition from without leads to insincere and artificial writing.

c. Great writers use beautiful words because they have beautiful thoughts.

C. The style of a great author will be the faithful image of his mind, and this no less in oratory than in poetry. (§§ 15-17.)

D. Elaborateness of composition is no mark of trick or artifice in an author. (§§ 18-21.)

a. Elaborateness of composition is admitted in the fine arts.

b. Many, or most, writers are elaborate in the sense of painstaking.

c. While, therefore, the mere dealer in words cares little or nothing for his subject, it is the artist's concern for his subject that makes him aim at appropriate expression.

II. To be capable of easy translation is no test of the excellence of a composition. (§§ 22-23.)

A. Such doctrine, *i. e.*, to be capable of easy translation is a test of the excellence of a composition, goes on the false assumption that one language is just like another. (§ 22.)

B. What can be done in one fine art cannot be done in another. (§ 23.)

III. Scripture is not easy of translation and is often elaborate and hard to understand. (§§ 24-28.)

A. Scripture is not easy of translation. There have been few good translations.

B. Scripture is, in a great measure, elaborate, as, a) the Epistle to the Hebrews; b) The Book of Job; c) the Psalter.

C. Scripture is often hard to understand, as, a) the Prophets; b) St. Paul.

D. It does not militate against the doctrine just laid down that there are portions of Scripture simple in style and meaning and impersonal in treatment; such portions are science rather than literature.

Questions and Studies

1. Does the Lecture show a division into introduction, body of the discussion and conclusion?

2. What does the introduction aim at? Does it simply announce the subject? Are we informed when and where the Lecture was delivered and to what kind of audience? What effect would you expect these circumstances to have on the author's method of treatment? on his style? Does the author divide the discussion into points? Is there a formal announcement of this division? What are the advantages of this method? the possible disadvantages? Discuss the author's purpose and point of view.

3. A conclusion may sum up the entire discussion or emphasize one or more points of it or even introduce some new and important topics. What does the author's conclusion aim at? Is it purely expository in tone or do you find any attempt at persuasion or appeal?

4. The two typical processes of exposition are definition and division. Are both used? A term may be expounded by the familiar methods of Obverse Statement (telling what a thing is not), Repetition, Illustration, Comparison, Contrast, etc. See whether and to what extent these or other methods are employed. Does

any one of them predominate? 5. Do you find a logical nexus between the three points of the discussion? Is the arrangement of these points the most effective for the author's purpose? Why is the first of them treated at much greater length than the other two? What are these points stated as propositions? Summarize the arguments by which the author establishes each of the propositions. Note the illustrations used and their argumentative value. Are there any digressions? If so, how do these affect the unity of the work? 6. Newman is said to pay particular heed to climax in the development of his themes. What do you understand by climax? Is there evidence of it in the Lecture? 7. Is the Lecture mainly exposition? or mainly argumentation? Could you characterize it as exposition gaining its end by argumentative methods? Justify your answer. To what extent is refutation or negative argumentation employed? What are the particular forms of argument used? 8. "In this essay (Newman's *Literature*) are represented not only the wide scope of Newman's intellectual interests, but the masterly orderliness of his mental processes and the metaphysical inclinations of his mind. Newman was never afraid to permit the skeleton of the literary structure to show. He had remarkably developed the gift of vivifying any theme he treated, yet through the finished product the process of construction always was manifest. . . . No essay of the century

displays better balance among the parts than does this" (Dickenson-Roe: *Nineteenth Century English Prose*, p. 243). Can you justify this criticism, point by point? 9. "The essay on Literature evidences, also, the author's homiletical training. It advances through ten stately periods from the exordium, in which the interrogation is broached to the homily, in which the spiritual truths are applied to concrete facts" (*Id.*, p. 243). What do you take to be the 'homily' in question? What is the significance of the term 'homily' as used here?

B. STYLE

A. GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF NEWMAN'S STYLE

All classic prose will show in varying proportions the three fundamental qualities of clearness, force, and elegance. The union of force and elegance is a peculiarly difficult one to achieve. Clearness is such a primary and obvious requisite of expression that we have a right to expect it even in the most mediocre style; but force and elegance or rather their harmonious adjustment, appear to be the supreme test of classic prose. The ideal of English prose style is accordingly best conceived as consisting in a due balance and proportion between these two easily conflicting qualities. It is precisely here that Newman achieves a signal triumph. He is forceful without being abrupt or unmusical; and he is graceful and even elegant without being feeble or unimpressive. He has Carlyle's virile energy of expression without Carlyle's jolts and jars; he has Matthew Arnold's urbanity of manner without Arnold's recurring self-consciousness and consequent loss of strength. His style, indeed, while it employs every grace and refinement of expression, does not by any means suggest a sort of holiday manner, one for large occa-

sions only and unsuited to ordinary needs. On the contrary, there is something practical and businesslike about it and that to a degree not exemplified perhaps in any other English writer: it is earnest, straightforward, unaffected, in a word, the very manner we should expect in a man deeply concerned to impart to others the things he has at heart and quite content to use his exceptional resources of expression solely with that end in view.

Clearness. This comes first among the requisites of a good style. The absence of it defeats the very purpose for which language exists, namely, the communication of thought. What pains Newman took to be clear we know from his own words. "I think I have never written for writing's sake," he says in a letter dated April, 1869, when he was sixty-eight; "but my one single desire and aim has been to do what is so difficult, viz., to express clearly and exactly my meaning." Again, writing to W. S. Lilly, he advises: "Be sure you grasp fully any view which you seek to combat, and leave no room for doubt about your meaning." The critics are at one in declaring that the Cardinal realized his own ideal of clearness. "The pure style of Newman may be compared in its distinguishing quality to the atmosphere. It is at once simple and subtle, vigorous and elastic; it penetrates into every recess of its subject; it is transparent, allowing each object it touches to dis-

play its own proper color" (H. E. Beeching: *English Prose*).

Force. Language is forceful when it takes up and carries over emotion and passion from one person to another. Force is therefore the emotional as clearness is the intellectual element in good style. It depends on a variety of causes, on mental and moral temperament first of all, but largely also on such rhetorical considerations as choice of words, the proper massing of phrase, sentence, paragraph, etc. A subtle, pervasive, at times overmastering, energy or force is one of the most easily felt qualities of Newman's prose. Given a man of his intense spiritual nature and emotional capabilities on the one hand, and great literary gifts on the other, and we should expect the written expression of his thought to be vigorous and forceful, if anything.

Elegance. Good prose will do more than convey human thought and feeling. It will stimulate æsthetic pleasure and delight by the presence in it of such qualities as symmetry, grace, urbanity, finish, smoothness, melody, rhythm, all of which may be considered factors in the complex and inclusive quality of elegance or beauty. This is sometimes called the third or æsthetic element of style. Newman's English has become a synonym for elegance in all its phases. "The finish and urbanity of Cardinal Newman's prose has been universally commended, even by those most strenu-

ously opposed to his opinions" (H. J. Nicoll). "In its union of scholarliness and urbanity it is unique" (L. E. Gates). "The work of Newman reveals him as one of the great masters of graceful, scholarly, finished prose. It is individual, it has charm, and this is the secret of its power to interest" (A. J. George: *Types of Literary Art*). "Newman is never clumsy, never crude, but always graceful, always mellowed" (A. Birrell: *Res Judicatae*).

Questions and Studies

1. 'Decision' is said to be a striking quality of Newman's prose. Explain. 2. Newman shows exceptional powers of exposition. What qualities of his style serve him best here? 3. It has been alleged that his style is perhaps too clear and explicit, that it does too much for the reader and loses much of the charm and stimulus that come from suggestion rather than from copious and explicit statement. What is to be said for or against this view? 4. There is often a touch of vagueness about the terms 'energy' and 'force' as used in literary criticism. State as clearly as possible what you conceive to be the nature of Newman's force. How does his force differ from Carlyle's? Macaulay's? Burke's? Webster's? Determine as far as possible the various causes to which his force is due.

5. What ideas are conveyed to you by the term 'urbanity,' as applied to Newman's prose? 6. Newman was a conscious artist. "It is simply the fact," he wrote to a friend, "that I have been obliged to take great pains with everything I have written, and I often write chapters over and over

again, besides innumerable corrections and inter-linear additions." Would you infer from this confession that his style is self-conscious? Analyze the notion of self-consciousness in style and determine whether and to what extent Newman is free from it. 7. Is simplicity the same as clearness? We have seen that Newman is clear. Is he also simple? or rather is he ornate? Can either epithet be applied to his style without qualification? 8. Assuming that melody (tone-color, agreeable combinations of vowels and consonants) and rhythm (periodic recurrence of the same sound or combinations of sounds) are distinct effects in style, would you call Newman's prose melodious? rhythmical? English verse-rhythm is chiefly accentual; prose-rhythm, phrasal (cf. Genung: *Working Principles of Rhetoric*, p. 202). Illustrate the phrasal character of prose-rhythm by passages from Newman. Explain the difference between good prose-rhythm and the "sing-song of pseudo-poetic prose." Is it possible to scan, at least partially, Newman's rhythmical passages? What do you conceive to be the difference between Newman's rhythm and Macaulay's? De Quincey's?

9. It is said that Newman achieves a great manner without the least trace of mannerism." Discuss the import of this criticism. What mannerisms, if any, have you noted in English authors? 10. Newman declared that he was more indebted for his style to Cicero than to any other writer.

Can you see any points of resemblance between Cicero and Newman? any points of contrast?

II. Discuss the particulars of the following criticisms:

(a.) "It (Newman's style) has the admirable sentence structure of Macaulay, improved in varied cadence and in simplicity; the exactness of De Quincey; the Saxon quality of John Bunyan, which is clear when it is not archaic; and a personal quality which is unique, the result of temperament and art which seem to have become one" (M. F. Egan: *Selections from the Prose and Poetry of John Henry Newman, Introduction*, xvii).

(b) "Perhaps no writer has less of the sensuous appeal of color and atmosphere, yet he is saved from chill by the very power of his thinking. So flexible is his diction, so rhythmic is the pulse and swell of his thought, that he often attains that most unusual of all perorations, the climax upon a course of abstract reasoning" (Dickinson and Roe: *Nineteenth Century English Prose*, p. 244).

(c) "His prose casts over the reader the spell exerted by the excellent novelist or poet. The mind is gently yet firmly directed into certain channels, and made to follow the course marked out for it. . . . He masses and groups particulars, the individual significance of which we cannot help confessing, with reference to a gener-

alization which seems to follow of itself, unaided by effort on our part or his. Link by link the chain of his logic is wound about us, and before we know it we are bound hand and foot in a bondage so pleasing that we almost prefer it to liberty. Whether he deliver an address, conduct an argument or relate a story, the result always seems predestined; easily, insensibly, yet inevitably, the reader feels himself impelled toward a foregone conclusion" (A. E. Cook: *Newman's Essay on Aristotle's Poetics*).

(d). "It is a great test of style to watch how an author disposes of the qualifications, limitations and exceptions that clog the wings of his main proposition. The grave and conscientious men of the seventeenth century insisted on packing them all honestly along with the main proposition itself, within the bounds of a single period. Burke arranges them in tolerably close order in the paragraph. Dr. Newman, that winning writer, disperses them lightly over his page" (Lord Morley: *Essay on Macaulay*).

(e) "Yet it is a mistake to think that the excellence of his style is apparent to the casual observer. The critics, indeed, are agreed for once, and because of their agreement they have fixed public opinion beyond a chance of change. But, whilst any man of ordinary literary perception could not fail to recognize in the presence of Macaulay, or Froude, or Pater that he had

met with something rare and good, it is more than doubtful how many men, ignorant of the context, would be aware of anything remarkable in a page of Newman. This is no doubt partly due to the fact that his manner was as business-like as it was delicate and proved a model which ordinary men found serviceable and made common. Lawyers, for example, say that Newman would have written a very good opinion. But, besides this, it is certain that, like all very perfect things, his style requires to be much looked at before it is truly admired, and that the homage paid to it is often simply conventional. Devoid of all show and glitter, *simplex munditiis*, always very plain and neat, it made its way because it was the vehicle of thoughts that much needed to be spoken; and only afterwards did men realize that the vehicle itself was beautiful. The proof of its excellence, if proof be required, is that it is impossible to caricature it" (Algernon Cecil: *Six Oxford Thinkers*, p. 105).

(f) "Newman's prose style is characterized at its best by an unobtrusive distinction, and by a kind of aërial transparency, in comparison with which even Arnold's prose appears slightly dense. Although Arnold's meaning is always perfectly clear, it reaches us, so to speak, through a resisting medium; we are conscious of his manner. Newman, it may almost be said, has no manner, or at least his manner is so completely

one with his matter that it passes unobserved; his words convey his meaning as ether conveys light. If Arnold is as clear as crystal, Newman is as clear as mountain air. This quality of style, by virtue of which it incorporates itself in meaning, and becomes, as it were, invisible, is the highest attainable quality; and Newman, in certain passages especially of his 'Apologia' and his 'Idea of a University,' has perhaps come nearer than any prose writer of this century in England, to the type of perfect prose" (Moody and Lovett: *A History of English Literature*, p. 342).

B. WORDS

Whatever may be said of the adequacy of Swift's definition of style, "proper words in proper places," it embodies, at all events, the most important element of the thing defined. Without organization themselves, words enter as the inevitable unit into every form of organized speech, whether sentence, paragraph, or whole discourse. What is the art of composition more than the art of choosing and arranging words with a view to the effective expression of thought? Hence, the literary artist reveals his power in nothing so much as in the skill with which word, phrase, and idiom are made to convey to the reader with subtle accuracy of transmission their burden of thought and feeling.

A few characteristics of Newman's vocabulary,

or diction, are here set down, though anything like an adequate verification of them will have to rest on a broader basis of the author's work than that afforded by the *Literature* alone.

1. **Simplicity.** Though Newman's writings are marked by a uniform scholarliness of tone and treatment, the vocabulary which he employs is at times remarkably plain and unadorned. He does not shrink from the use of simple terms, popular idioms, and homely turns of expression, with the result that his style is vigorous, spontaneous, and often colloquial in the ease and freedom of its diction. Yet the general level of his diction is high. With its constant suggestion of academic culture and refinement it is the diction of a scholar without cant or pedantry who can appropriate the forms of every-day speech without appropriating their possible associations of the commonplace or the vulgar.

2. **Individuality and Freshness.** Plain and homely phrasing is not necessarily a literary virtue; it may be merely evidence of a thin and colorless vocabulary. The problem before a writer who chooses to express himself in plain, simple terms, is how to use these terms with individuality and distinction. The words themselves, as mere dictionary units, may be bald and unsuggestive; but his *use* of them should be new, striking, in some way individual. Thus the adjective "high" may appear commonplace enough, but in the hands of an

artist like Shakespeare it develops unlooked-for possibilities. Thus he has *high deeds, high descent, high desert, high designs, high disgrace, high exploits, high feats, high heaven, high hope, high perfection, high resolve, high reward* (quoted by Lewis: *A First Book in Writing English*, p. 201).

The student will not fail to note in Newman the same power of using familiar terms with effectiveness and charm.

3. Aptness. The instinct for the right word is a manifest source of literary power. In Newman it was developed to an unusual degree, in consequence, no doubt, of his uniform sincerity of purpose, which made it habitual in him to express himself with rigorous accuracy and precision of language. The student can test for himself the aptness of the Cardinal's diction by occasionally substituting words and phrases of his own for those actually employed and noting the consequent loss in clearness, force, or other rhetorical quality.

4. Specificness, Concreteness. The value of the specific, particularized term for insuring vigor and emphasis of expression is one of the commonplaces of literary technique. Here, as with so many of the laws of good writing, we are dealing, not with mere arbitrary usage, but with a psychological fact. Vividness and intensity of inner experience are born not so much of general abstract ideas, as of particular, concrete ones. The

latter, with their accompanying appeal to the imagination, are what chiefly make our intellectual impressions clear-cut and vivid. Of course, general terms, too, have their function in language; without them exposition as a literary form would be impracticable.

The vigor of Newman's style is largely due to his concrete phraseology. "Other things being equal," says L. E. Gates, "he prefers the name of the species to that of the genus and the name of the class to that of the species; he is always urged forward to the material and the individual; his mind does not lag in the region of abstractions and formulas, but presses past the general term or abstraction or law to the image or example and into the tangible, glowing, sensible world of fact."

5. Epigrammatic Vigor. Newman, like Burke, had the gift of epigram, the art of expressing a truth with brevity and point. A few examples may be cited. "It is a contradiction in terms to attempt a sinless literature of sinful man." "It (literature) is the Life and Remains of the natural man." "Ten thousand difficulties do not make one doubt." "Calculation never made a hero." "Be modest until you are victorious." "Great things are done by devotion to one idea."

Questions and Studies

1. Try to verify the above-mentioned characteristics of Newman's diction. 2. What other characteristic have you noted? Has the diction a Latin coloring? How do you justify the frequent use of Latin phrases and quotations? Find the ratio of Latin to Anglo-Saxon words in § 29. 3. Are any words repeated at close intervals? (cf. §§ 1, 6). Determine the rhetorical effect of such repetition. 4. Study the author's use of adjectives, particularly in §§ 22 and 29. "It is the adjective and adverb, most largely, that supply warmth, color, depth, to the assertion; to the austere outline of noun and verb they add, as it were, a wealth and amplitude of meaning which make the sentence a thing of animation and emotion. Without these style may easily become bald" (Genung: *The Working Principles of Rhetoric*, p. 150). 5. Are simple, every-day words used in fresh combinations with individual touch? 6. Note the use of idioms and conventional phrases: *e. g.*, *on a par with*, *in a measure*, *far be it from me*, *in like manner*, *make court to*, *went into the market*, *reads to advantage*, *etc.* Draw up a list of these expressions with a view to make them part of your own working vocabulary. 7. "*The job was carried out*" (§ 13). Are there other instances of homely phrasing? 8. It is usual to distinguish between the denotation

(direct meaning) and the connotation (implied meaning) of words. Have any words a coloring or extra signification due to connotation? 9. Tropes, or single-word figures, are constantly employed by good writers in the interests of vigor and picturesqueness. Thus: "When his imagination *wells up* it *overflows* in ornament; when his heart is *touched* it *thrills along* his verse" (§ 29). Note other instances of these single-word figures and try to determine their influence on the style. 10. There are numerous examples of simile. Point them out. What other figures have you noted? Would you characterize the diction as figurative? 11. Discuss the meaning and fitness for the author's purpose of the following words: (1) *large*, (2) *quite*, *prettinesses*; (3) *challenge*; (9) *severe*, *compass*; (11) *fertile*, *double*; (12) *superinduced*, *deprecate*; (13) *heavyish*; (14) *contemporaneous*; (15) *merc*, *lofty*, *elocution*, *resource*; (17) *declamation*, *status*, *magnanimity*; (19) *prototypal*; (20) *elaborate*, *fastidiousness*, *notorious*; (21) *acknowledging*; (22) *idiosyncratic*; (27) *militate*; (29) *single-minded*, *low*, *lucid*, *otiose*, *rich*, *luminous*, *embarrasses*, *tesselated*; (30) *catholic*, *ecumenical*. Look up the derivation of *literature*, *deprecate*, *contemporaneous*, *elocution*, *prototypal*, *elaborate*, *idiosyncratic*, *otiose*, *catholic*, *ecumenical*. 12. "One characteristic of the purely suggestive style is certainly to be found in Newman's writing—great beauty and vigor of phrase" (Gates: *New-*

man as a Prose Writer, p. 101). Get a clear understanding of what is meant by "beauty and vigor of phrase" and find illustrations of the same. 13. "Magnificent as this or that passage may appear to us, yet we find, upon examination, that it is composed of the plainest words, and there is not a word that could be bettered, nor one altered, without serious damage both to the sense and the melody of the passage" (W. J. Dawson: *The Makers of English Prose*, p. 293). "Among his sermons is a very powerful one on *Unreal Words*, in which he argues that words are real things, that insincere language is the expression of an insincere temper, and that 'words have a meaning whether we mean that meaning or not'; certainly Newman never uses a word without the most scrupulous regard to its real meaning, and hence the convincing sincerity, as well as the literary compactness of his style" (Id., p. 293). Try to verify these estimates.

C. SENTENCES

While Newman's sentences range through all the variations of grammatical and structural type, they are made to obey one law with scrupulous fidelity, and that is the law of variety; indeed, this flexibility of grammatical construction and absence of anything like a monotonously recurrent sentence-form have much to do with the ease and naturalness of his style. One trait, however, of somewhat fre-

quent occurrence in his sentences is to be noted; and that is, their balance. This is a rhetorical device, of course, but a device which Newman employs with customary caution. It may be observed here that balance or parallel-structure in rhetorical theory is not quite the same thing as antithesis. The balanced sentence implies a succession of clauses or sentence-parts in which similarity or even opposition of ideas is borne out and emphasized by iteration of the same structural forms. A balanced sentence, therefore, may or may not be antithetical in content. Of the two following sentences, both balanced, only the first is antithetical. "They write Latin; Cicero writes Roman." "Such preëminently is Shakespeare among ourselves; such preëminently Virgil among the Latins; such in their degree are all those writers who, in every nation, go by the name of Classics."

The principle of balance or parallel-structure, as set forth in modern text-books of rhetoric, will be found to answer in many of its applications to the figure "repetition" of the older rhetoricians. Repetition, we know, is a favorite device of Cicero's; hence it is not surprising to hear a critic say of Newman's balance that it suggests Cicero more than any modern writer.

The balanced sentence, as used by Newman, is characterized by Genung (*Rhetorical Analysis*, p. 113) as "a cumulative sentence-structure, consisting of a number of simple clauses with common

bearing, building up by simple accretion a detailed idea"; and by Brewster (*Studies in Structure and Style*, p. 277), as "the adding of clause to clause, and the piling-up of a series of like constructions." The effects of this form of sentence are briskness of movement, increased coherence, and a sense of gradual advance to some climax of idea. But it also has disadvantages, due chiefly to its strongly artificial character. Still, Newman, with the artist's consciousness that every technical resource has its limitations, is careful not to carry the balance of his sentences beyond due limits.

Questions and Studies

1. Classify the sentences of one or more paragraphs with reference to length, grammatical structure (simple, complex, compound), and rhetorical structure (loose, periodic, balanced), and note the variety of types employed. 2. The average sentence-length in modern English prose is said to be between twenty-five and thirty words. Compute, on a basis of seventy-five or a hundred sentences, Newman's average sentence-length. How do his sentences compare in length with Irving's? with Macaulay's? Do you consider his sentence-length a suitable one for an effective present-day style, say, in journalism? 3. Compute on a basis of seventy-five or a hundred sentences the ratio between loose and periodic forms. Point out the best examples of the

periodic type. How would you classify the single sentence of § 31? Are there any examples of the complete period, *i. e.*, in which the sense is suspended quite to the end? Has the style a distinct periodic effect? 4. Point out examples of the author's use of balance, and analyze the rhetorical effects of such use. How does the balance of Newman's sentences differ from Macaulay's? 5. Are there any instances in which a distinct rhetorical effect (*e. g.*, of emphasis or climax) is due to the sentence-form employed? 6. Are exclamatory sentences used frequently? interrogative? antithetical? epigrammatic? What does the style owe to these various forms? 7. Do the sentences stand the test of the three great constructive principles of unity, mass, coherence? Are they uniformly clear? 8. Newman's style is harmonious and rhythmical because his sentences are so. On what do their harmony and rhythm depend? In the construction of his sentences more than one great stylist has looked to the effect they have when read aloud. What is your experience in reading Newman aloud? 9. The reading aloud of passages from Newman will make one feel, among other things, the movement of his sentences. What is movement in style? What are its advantages? the rhetorical conditions and devices on which it depends?

D. PARAGRAPHS

The theory of the English paragraph, its function and laws will be found discussed in any of the standard manuals of rhetoric. The paragraph is now recognized to be not a conventional, but a natural and inevitable unit of organized speech. In the logical and orderly development of any subject the natural processes of the mind carry it forward through a series of distinct stadia or stages to its intellectual goal. To these successive stadia in the thought-development will correspond the paragraphs, which, whether represented or not to the eye by the device of indention, will be found to be intimately vital and organic elements of the thought in speech.

Newman's paragraphs stand the usual tests of good paragraph-structure. Less regular in plan, perhaps, than Macaulay's, they gain over the latter in flexibility of treatment and especially in subtle continuity of thought. This last-named characteristic, a characteristic due in great measure to his skillful use of connectives, challenges the student's attention as much as any other of Newman's prose. The asyndeton-structure of paragraph, exemplified chiefly in Macaulay, has the advantage, no doubt, of making for rapidity of movement and increased animation of style; but it secures these qualities at the expense of others which we look

for in the best literary art. To fix in words the delicate gradations, the constant forward tendency, the thousand-and-one points of logical contact in a body of well-reasoned, progressive thought, is a difficult problem of literary expression, sometimes a baffling one; but the solution of the problem, when it comes, will be found, in most cases, to be a matter of proper connectives more than of anything else. This is the function, therefore, of connective words and particles; they help to insure that delicate adjustment and cohesion of ideas which, under various names, as sequence, continuity, coherence, etc., is felt to be a distinguishing quality of literary excellence, at least in prose.

The most cursory examination of Newman's sentences and paragraphs will show that he makes an extensive use of connectives. Thus the number of connectives, initial and interior, employed in five hundred periods by various English writers is as follows: Newman, 1,697; Pater, 1,269; Arnold, 1,254; Irving, 959; Lowell, 920; Emerson, 851; Hawthorne, 713; Holmes, 347 (L. A. Sherman: *Analytics of Literature*, chap xxvi). The logical relations between clauses and sentences may often be indicated by other means than the use of conjunctions and similar link-words, for example, by juxtaposition of the related parts; still it may safely be said that such logical relations as it is desirable to indicate will hardly receive adequate expression at the hands of a writer who is not

alive to the value of connectives and practiced in their use.

Questions and Studies

1. Find the average length of the paragraphs on the basis of the number of words contained, and compare it with the average paragraph-length of other authors. (Paragraph-length is a matter of importance in English prose. Very short paragraphs are liable to convey an impression of superficial treatment, sometimes of sensational appeal; very long ones weary the attention and easily become involved. Here, as elsewhere in good writing, the principle of variety is paramount. The student must learn to vary the length of his paragraphs at need, without running to extremes either of brevity or length.) 2. Have the paragraphs unity? To determine this find their topic-sentences. 3. Test some or all of the paragraphs for coherence. 4. Indicate the connectives that link sentence with sentence and paragraph with paragraph. 5. Are the paragraphs well massed? Mass or emphasis in a paragraph requires among other things, that it begin and end with "words that deserve distinction." Observe the beginning and end of the paragraphs and note whether the importance of the words there found is in keeping with their conspicuous position. 6. The opening sentence of a paragraph is more often short and condensed

than long. The closing sentence is often longer and more elaborate in structure than the opening one. However, the closing sentence is sometimes short and epigrammatic, giving what is called an "epigrammatic close" to the paragraph. Find, if possible, paragraphs to exemplify these statements.

7. The preliminary paragraph merely announces a new phase or point of discussion; the transitional paragraph marks the end of one division of the discussion and the beginning of another; the summarizing paragraph recapitulates the various heads of a discussion. Are there examples of these types?

8. A paragraph-topic can be developed by various methods, *e. g.*, repetition, definition, contrast or obverse statement, illustration, particulars or details, proof, etc. Point out the use of repetition, contrast, illustration in § 11; of repetition, illustration, particulars in § 15. Analyze the topical development of other paragraphs.

9. "Newman's paragraphs are the result of the most careful analysis on the part of their writer. In them unity, usually philosophical, often complex, is severely observed. . . . The most careful selection of thought is made, and whatever subsidiary matter may have been generated in the act of composition is strictly repressed in the writing. In this matter we may compare Newman and De Quincey—both artistic minds. Both men are interested in the various phases of the material they use for any given purpose, though, of course, Newman less

than De Quincey in the sensuous qualities. But De Quincey cannot express one phase of his interest at a time; Newman can. We find Newman not, indeed, depending on connectives for coherence, but using them freely for increased accuracy" (Edwin Herbert Lewis: *The History of the English Paragraph*, p. 151). Discuss this criticism.

STUDIES IN LITERARY THEORY

A. THE DEFINITION OF LITERATURE

The attempt to frame a definition of literature is an exercise that any advanced English class can engage in with interest and profit. The difficulty of fixing the precise content of idea represented by such terms as poetry, literature, eloquence, beauty, etc., has long been recognized and, hence, new definitions of them can scarcely hope to achieve the praise of finality. In particular, the word "literature" in popular and even in literary usage, shifts to and fro amid a variety of meanings. We speak with equal propriety of Greek literature and the literature of chemistry. It is only one instance out of a thousand of the limitations of language, which makes the same symbol do service for a multiplicity of ideas. Here we seek to fix the meaning of literature as we predicate it with common accord of classic productions in prose and verse. The attempt to confine within a rigid and compendious formula the absolutely indispensable elements of the thing "literature" will help to

clear up more than one problem with which the student of letters has to do. Only be it not forgotten that the results achieved will be at best tentative and not final.

In framing a definition of literature attend to the following:

1. A definition of literature should be so framed as to include all works which the general consent of educated persons has declared to be true literature. Thus a definition which leaves out of its range of application Horace's lyrics or Pope's *Essay on Criticism* is clearly defective.

2. A definition may be *scientific* or else merely *rhetorical*; *scientific*, if it names the genus or class and specific difference of the thing defined; *rhetorical*, if it aims merely at suggestive effect, by naming and thereby fixing attention on one or more significant traits. The definitions of literature met with in authors and text-books make no pretensions, as a rule, to scientific accuracy and completeness, and hence are ordinarily of the rhetorical or suggestive kind.

3. A *working definition* is one constructed in the interests of convenience and practical use, rather than of philosophical accuracy. It brings together in handy and portable form the more important elements of the thing defined and is called a working definition because with it in hand the student can proceed intelligently and securely in his work of criticism and research.

Some Definitions of Literature. The following definitions will offer the student material for analysis and discussion. They may be dealt with according to the points contained in the questions below.

a). "All knowledge that reaches us through books is literature" (Matthew Arnold: *Discourses in America*).

b). "The written thoughts and feelings of intelligent men and women, arranged in a way that shall give pleasure to the reader" (Brooke: *English Literature*).

c). "By letters or literature is meant the expression of thought in language where by 'thought' I mean the ideas, feelings, views, reasonings, and other operations of the human mind" (Newman: *Literature*, § 29).

d). "Literature consists of all the books . . . where moral truth and human passion are touched with a certain largeness, sanity, and attractiveness of form" (Morley: *On the Study of Literature*).

e). "Literature is the verbal expression of man's affections as acted upon in his relations with the material world, society, and his Creator" (Brother Azarias: *The Philosophy of Literature*, p. 11).

f). "The inspiration of some phase of life, and the stamp of some form of beauty, are the characteristics of all true works of literature" (Mabie: *Short Studies in Literature*, p. 51).

g). "We may be content to set out with a rough

definition of literature as consisting of works which, whether in prose or verse, are the handicraft of imagination rather than reflection, aim at the pleasure of the greatest possible number of the nation, rather than instruction and practical effects, and appeal to general rather than specialized knowledge" (Posnett: *Comparative Literature*, p. 18).

h). "Literature is the *artistic embodiment in speech (written or oral) of personal thought of a broadly human and enduring character.*" This is an example of a working-definition put to the test of class-room use with satisfactory results. The exposition of its various terms will bring out all that is essential to the notion of literature. "Thought" is to be taken broadly, as Newman takes it: "The ideas, feelings, views, reasonings, and other operations of the human mind."

Questions and Studies *

1. Does the definition under examination assume that literature is a fine art? 2. Does it include compositions transmitted by word of mouth? 3. Does it throw emphasis equally upon prose and poetry? 4. Does it include all literary types? 5. Does it imply that form is relatively more impor-

* For a few of the questions contained in the Literary Studies the editor is indebted to Gayley and Scott's *Methods and Materials of Literary Criticism*, through the courtesy of the publishers, Ginn & Co.

tant than substance or vice versa? 6. Can it be considered a scientific definition? 7. Is it applicable to compositions not generally regarded as literature? 8. Does it overlook altogether the element of artistic form? 9. Has it rhetorical merit by suggesting more than it states directly? 10. Is it a satisfactory working-definition? 11. Does it contain positive error, or does it fail only in a negative way, i. e., by not saying enough?

B. NEWMAN'S THEORY OF LITERATURE

Newman's *Literature* does not follow the rigid lines of scientific inquiry. It treats the subject with refreshing breadth of view, in the spirit and according to the methods of popular, suggestive exposition. In his own luminous and decisive way the author emphasizes a few basic truths regarding literature, rather than constructs with pretensions to scientific accuracy a rounded and inclusive theory of it as a whole. Most significant of the truths thus emphasized are these three:

a) The personal character of literature; b) the organic unity of thought and speech; c) the gift of expression as the supreme test of literary power.

Certain fallacious views of literature, summarized in three propositions, furnish the author a starting point for his treatment, which is expository in scope if not in method. In the process of demolishing the views in question, he gradually brings

to the surface what is vital and fundamental in literature, which is conceived to be in substance a revelation through language of personality both *individual* and *social*.

Questions and Studies

1. Newman describes literature as "the expression of thought in language" (§ 29). Would these words, without the explanation afforded by the context, be an adequate definition of literature? What does the author understand by "the faculty of expression" (§ 29)? Explain the phrase "in a large sense" (§ 29). 2. What do you take to be the specific element in Newman's conception of literature? Is it personality? expression? artistic form? notable content of thought and feeling? Does his definition of literature apply equally to prose and verse? Does it include all literary types? 3. "Literature is the personal use of language" (§ 10). Are these words the key to Newman's theory of literature? Explain. 4. "What distinguishes a work of literature, what gives it its approved value, is its style. This must be the final measure of its excellence" (Baldwin: *A College Manual of Rhetoric*, p. 199). "Form is the criterion of literature" (Johnson: *Elements of Literary Criticism*, p. 2). Do these estimates coincide with Newman's? 5. "Style is a thinking out in language" (§ 11). Discuss the merits of this state-

ment as a definition of style. What conception of style does it embody? Compare with other definitions of style, *e. g.*, "The style is the man himself" (Buffon); "proper words in proper places" (Swift).

6. What does Newman mean by saying that an author's style is "the image of his mind" (§ 15)?

7. What conclusion in support of his position does he draw from the circumstance that literature in its primary idea addresses itself to the ear, not to the eye (§ 8)?

8. The words of one language do not ordinarily possess the same connotative power, *i. e.*, range of association and suggestion as the corresponding words in other languages. What argumentative use does Newman make of this fact (§ 22)?

9. "Literature expresses, not objective truth, as it is called, but subjective; not things, but thoughts" (§ 8). "Science, then, has to do with things, literature with thoughts; science is universal literature is personal" (§ 9). Try to make clear to your instructor or to the class the import of these propositions.

10. What, in Newman's mind, is the precise difference between literature and science?

11. "Elaborateness in composition is no mark of trick or artifice in an author" (§ 18). Explain the terms of this proposition. How is the truth of it established?

12. The analogy of soul and body is a stock one to illustrate the relation between substance and form in literature. Discuss the value of the analogy and compare it with those used by the author, "When we can separate light

and illumination," etc. (§ 11). 13. "Style has an absolute value like the product of any other exquisite art, quite distinct from the value of the subject about which it is employed, and irrelatively to the subject; precisely as the fine workmanship of Scopas the Greek or of Cellini the Florentine, is equally valued by the connoisseur, whether embodied in bronze or marble, in an ivory or a golden vase" (De Quincey: *Essay on Language*). Discuss the truth of this view and its compatibility with the views set forth in the Lecture. 14. In view of the main contention of the Lecture that literature is the personal use of language, what is to be said of the practice of imitating great authors? Is such imitation possible? In what sense is the imitation of classical writers legitimate and useful? 15. The Principle of Sincerity, as explained by Lewes: *Principles of Success in Literature*, requires that a writer be "true to his own soul and not try to express the thought of another." Point out equivalent statements of the same principle in the Lecture. 16. "To have a specific style is to be poor in speech . . . The perfect writer will express himself as Junius, when in the Junius frame of mind; when he feels as Lamb felt, will use a like familiar speech; and will fall into the ruggedness of Carlyle when in the Carlylean mood" (Spencer: *The Philosophy of Style*). The truth of these statements has been called into question. Do they agree with Newman's conception of style? 17.

"In spite of his reputation as a careful thinker and a clever logician, to say nothing of his own excellent command of 'the twofold logos,' he (Newman) nevertheless speaks of style in a somewhat confusing way, though he by no means invests the term with the haziness of popular usage. He writes in paragraph 9 as if style were distinct from phraseology, idiom, composition, rhythm, eloquence. Again, the idea that it is a peculiarly personal thing underlies the whole thesis, and this idea of personality assumes a national significance in paragraph 10 and his remarks on Cicero in paragraph 17. It is furthermore related to thought, is a thinking out into language (paragraph 11), and is related to matter as well as to mind. In the phrase "delicacy and beauty of style" (paragraph 14), it may be said to refer to an abstract idea of excellence, just as the angels of Fra Angelico may be said to be goodness without personality. It has also to do with occasion (paragraph 19), varies with it, and hence may be said to fall into different types (paragraph 23). The sum of the matter (29) seems to be that it concerns: (1) the thought, (2) the personality of the writer, and (3) the audience" (W. T. Brewster: *Representative Essays on the Theory of Style*). Study this criticism. Is Newman's alleged looseness in the use of the term "style" to be justified on any ground? Collate the various uses of the term in the lecture and determine to what extent, if any, they are "confusing."

C. THE FUNCTION OF LITERATURE

None of the many questions raised by a critical study of literature is of more vital interest than that of its scope or function. What does it do for us? What advantage can we hope to gain from an acquaintance with it? These are pertinent questions; let us try to answer them correctly.

a). Man is a being of curiously complex and diversified activities. He has understanding, memory, will, fancy, imagination, emotion, æsthetic sensibility. For certain, or even all, of these powers literature furnishes wholesome and abundant stimulus. Man likes to transport himself beyond the humdrum associations of this workaday world to a world of imaginative and ideal delights; he is aided in the attempt by literature. He recognizes in himself an ennobling instinct and craving for ideal perfection or beauty, and he finds that literature, in a measure, gratifies the craving. To please in an intellectual and æsthetic sense, to stimulate into healthful and pleasurable activity some of the noblest instincts and faculties of the soul, will, therefore, be the immediate function of literature.

b). But the wholesome influences of literature do not reach beyond certain limits. It cannot, after all, do everything for us. There are certain sides of human nature to which it makes no appeal at all,

or a very feeble one. It cannot, for example, become a substitute for religion. The influence of religion in purifying human thought and emotion, in ennobling human conduct and steadying it under pressure of suffering and distress, is an influence that literature cannot supply. It will be found, indeed, that the attempt to magnify the value of literature as an instrument of moral and spiritual education has proceeded generally from persons out of sympathy with religious belief. An example in point is Matthew Arnold, who, in his *Essay on Poetry*, predicts that the ministry of moral inspiration and support hitherto exercised by religion will eventually be taken over by poetry.

c). Bearing upon the scope or function of literature, is the question of moral purpose in art and of the effect of such purpose on work produced under its influence. May the literary artist, the writer, undertake deliberately to secure some end over and above the end of pleasure essential to all artistic work? May he, for instance, through his poem, novel, or play, aim to bring about some much-needed social reform, or to inculcate a theory or doctrine, or to impart some definite spiritual good? Or will such intention deliberately admitted, spoil the artistic quality of his work? Here we touch on the so-called "Art for Art's sake" theory, according to which the artist must eschew all conscious moral purpose and aim solely to please, under penalty of spoiling his art. The solution of

the problem will turn on the question whether artistic quality and deliberate moral purpose are, in the nature of things, incompatible elements. *Solvitur ambulando*. More than one literary masterpiece has been composed with didactic intent.

Newman in prose and De Vere in poetry are examples of writers who achieved a great artistic success in the very act of expressing religious truth and emotion. Their work is charming, otherwise it would not be literature; but it is also instructive, otherwise their primary intention would have miscarried. If beauty is the splendor of truth, there is no reason why beauty and truth may not enter the mind together and by the same door. Unfortunately, didacticism in literature does not always mean the service of truth. Perhaps the novel of purpose is oftener the vehicle of false, irreligious principles than of sound ones. Still, here, as elsewhere, abuse does not bar the way to legitimate use.

d). To sum up, we may distinguish between the aim of a *literary work* and the aim of the *literary worker*, or writer. The *immediate* aim of every literary work, in as far as it is literature, *must* be wholesome, intellectual, and emotional pleasure (though this need not be the result primarily aimed at in the mind of the writer). The *mediate* aim of a literary work may be instruction, secular, moral, or religious, and in much great literature such aim is attempted and realized. *The aim of the literary*

worker may be, and perhaps generally is, identical with that of the work which he produces; but it is sometimes to be distinguished from any purpose which the literary product, as such, is capable of serving. Often it is the mere joy of self-expression, the satisfaction felt by the artist in giving concrete shape to the ideal within him, that supplies the chief impulse to literary effort. Again, considerations of a more practical kind may be the inspiring motive. Scott's latest literary output was due to a determined effort to satisfy his creditors. Johnson wrote "Rasselas" to meet the expenses of his mother's funeral. *The aim of the writer* may thus cover a wide range of motives, from the artist's joy in his work to the desire of fame and the making of money.

Questions and Studies

1. Is moral purpose essential to literary art? 2. Are there any sound reasons why such purpose should render artistic work impossible? 3. Name some literary masterpiece which is didactic in aim. Is the author's plea or theory or message set forth frankly and in explicit terms, or is it conveyed merely by implication? What effect, if any, has his didactic purpose on the literary quality of his work? 4. Can you mention some works of literature which were written solely to please? 5. Have you met in your reading with any extravagant claims made

for literature as a moral and spiritual help? 6. From the fact that certain parts of Holy Scripture are commonly regarded as literature of a high order, what inference would you draw touching the "Art for Art's sake" theory? 7. "If we lose sight of the fact that art in general and poetry in particular are meant to impart pleasure as their primary end, we fall into endless confusions. There is, however, a bad association with the name 'pleasure' that makes us wish to disconnect it from the noble vocation of the poet . . . Poetry, whether or not it criticises life, should use its peculiar resources to make us less miserable or more joyous. As relief in depression, as consolation in sorrow, as an antidote to the ills of life, poetry has been welcomed from its birth . . . If the poet performs any other function at the same time—if he instructs us in the laws of things, if he directs our paths when we are in difficulty—all these are superadded functions, and must not displace the primary requisite of contributing to our enjoyment or lessening our misery" (Bain: *On Teaching English*, pp. 237, 238). "Its (*i. e.* literature's) legitimate function is to interpret the fainter emotions of our nature" (Azarias: *Philosophy of Literature*, p. 272). Discuss these passages.

D. SUBSTANCE AND FORM IN LITERATURE

Every literary product is integrated of two elements—substance and form. By substance is understood the subject-matter or content, generally a complex element reducible to the four simpler ones of thought, emotion, imagination, and beauty. Beauty, as far as it belongs to the subject-matter, will present itself as an aspect of the thought, emotion, or imagination. Literary form or expression shows three important phases—style, structure, and, in the case of poetry, meter.

Insistence on Literary Content. One may defend the view that literary substance or content, isolated and viewed apart, as far as such a thing is possible, is a more vital element than literary form. What literature can communicate to us in the way of uplifting thought and sentiment, seems a weightier thing than the medium of language and style through which the communication is made. The most obvious relation of literary form to literary substance is that of means to end; and a means, to speak the language of philosophy, is on a lower level of dignity and importance than the end or purpose which it serves. With such premise for a starting point we should arrive at the conclusion that the vitalizing element in literature is not form, but substance; not the *how*, but the *what*; not the artistic setting of a thought, but

the thought itself segregated from all setting, artistic or otherwise. Yet such a conclusion has its difficulties, too, so that to fix the limitations which make it tenable will require careful thinking on the part of the student.

In actual composition, no doubt, a writer can attend more to matter than to form, to what he says than to how he says it, a practice which De Quincey thought was carried to extremes by English authors. "Here (properly speaking) our quarrel is coëxtensive with that general principle in England which tends in all things to set the matter above the manner, the substance above the external show—a principle noble in itself, but essentially wrong whenever the manner blends inseparably with the substance. In no country upon earth, were it possible to carry such a maxim into effect, is it a more determinate tendency of the national mind to value the *matter* of a book not only as paramount to the *manner*, but even as distinct from it, and as capable of a separate insulation" (De Quincey: *Essay on Style*, p. 5).

Insistence on Literary Form. A strong case may be made out in favor of the view that literature is chiefly a matter of artistic form. After all, may not a literary masterpiece, a bit of lyric, for example, derive its value not so much from the thought, which may be neither new nor striking, as from the exquisite setting that is given to the thought? The keenest of modern French critics,

Ferdinand Brunetière, assures us that the world's stock of ideas is fairly exhausted and that the most a present-day writer can hope to do is to say old things in a new way. Questions, therefore, of artistic form, of style, of workmanship appear to be the paramount ones in literature. *Non nova, sed nove* sums up the highest practical wisdom in literary art.

The Organic Unity of Substance and Form. It is obvious that literary content and form are not elements that can be set apart by physical division. When found at all, they are fused together with loss of individual entity to form the concrete thing which we call literature. It is only by an analytic process purely mental that they can be set asunder as though they were capable of distinct and separate existence. The question, therefore, of the value of the two elements in literature regards their relative, not their absolute value. To maintain that one is more vital than the other is not to maintain that either can be dispensed with in actual literary work. Newman's *Literature* will be found to lay particular insistence on the virtual identity and inseparability of the two elements when fused together in written or spoken speech. The whole question of literary form and content is not by any means as speculative as it looks; when sifted, it shows many important and practical bearings which the skilful instructor will not fail to bring to the notice of his class.

Questions and Studies

1. Has literature a distinctive content or subject-matter, or is its subject-matter coëxtensive with truth? 2. Which of the two integrating elements of literature, substance and form, is relatively the more important? 3. What periods or schools in the history of English literature illustrate the dangers of disregard of form? the dangers of undue insistence on form? 4. What English authors are noted for particular cultivation of style? for a certain carelessness of style? 5. Discuss the meaning and advantages of a "sense of literary form." 6. Analyze the meaning and practical bearings of the literary axiom '*non nova sed nove.*' How can one attend to it in actual literary work? 7. Can essentially trivial and insignificant thought be made into literature by artistic treatment, by form? 8. What is the meaning of the term "style" as applied to art in general? Its special use as applied to literature? 9. In what sense is the style the man? 10. Can style be preserved in translation from one language to another? 11. May style be cultivated for its own sake? (cf. Newman's *Literature*, § 12, and De Quincey's *Essay on Language*, p. 212, ed. by F. N. Scott.) 12. In what sense are the substance and form of a literary product organically *one*?

E. LITERATURE AND ART

The intelligent study of the relations between literature and art will demand of the student some clear-cut and accurate notions regarding the nature of art in general and of fine art in particular, the distinction between the fine and practical arts, etc. A few definitions will be of service. *Art* may mean: a) dexterity, skill in adapting means to end; b) a system of rules serving to facilitate the performance of certain actions, a method of doing well some special work (Webster); c) any concrete embodiment of human thought and feeling (cf. Crashaw: *The Interpretation of Literature*, p. 10). *Art* may be *practical*, i. e., serving utilitarian ends, e. g., comfort, knowledge; or *fine*, i. e., serving the ends of beauty and æsthetic delight; or *mixed*, i. e., serving the ends of both utility and beauty. *Artistic*, i. e., "characterized by art," and this either as showing skill in the adaptation of means to end or (with special connotation of fine art) as embodying in some way the element of beauty.

Questions and Studies

1. Is literature art? a fine art? The purpose of fine art is to embody and interpret the forms of beauty and thereby to stimulate intellectual, æsthetic pleasure. 2. Is literature a fine art in all its

branches? Poetry has at all times been reckoned among the fine arts, prose not so generally. What are we to understand by artistic prose? 3. Is history fine art or practical art? Is it possible for it to be both? Are there any works of history that deserve to be called fine art? 4. If literature is fine art, how does it differ from painting, music, architecture, in medium and content? 5. Is literature a practical art in any sense? 6. What ideas can be expressed in literature which cannot, at least with equal success, be expressed in other arts? As a medium of expression, how does it compare in effectiveness with the other arts? 7. Literature, among other essential elements, includes that of "artistic expression." What inference touching the question of literature as fine art can you draw from the term "artistic"? Is the artistic quality essential to literature, a quality of substance, or of form, or of both? 8. Write a paragraph embodying what you take to be the characteristic gifts and powers of a "literary artist." 9. "The æsthetic activity only concerns itself with the form in the beautiful object. Hence, in art, what causes æsthetic pleasure is the form. Now, in art the form is the expression, and so the essential foundation of art is the form of a thing, or beautiful expression. Therefore, the real end of art, given as the expression of beauty, becomes the beautiful expression of our thought; that is to say, that which is beautiful in art is the form, the expres-

sion; art's aim, which is to produce beauty, does so in the expression. The expression is beautiful, not necessarily the thought expressed . . . But what man can create is the form. In the execution of his idea he can put more or less beauty. This is why the artist can make the ugly beautiful; the matter may be ugly, but the form is beautiful, and it is precisely inasmuch as he can do this that a man is an artist. So the inside of a peasant's hut can become beautiful on the canvas of a Teniers, and the man who can do this we call an artist" (J. Wilfrid Parsons, S. J., *The Philosophy of Literature* in *The American Catholic Quarterly*, July, 1911). How does this conception of art, as applied to literature, differ from the conventional one, "the concrete expression of beauty"?

F. LITERATURE AND SCIENCE

The relation between literature and science is chiefly one of contrast. The contrast is pointed out in Newman's words: "Science, then, has to do with things, literature with thoughts; science is universal, literature is personal." Science, therefore, has to do with matter of fact, with objective truth, and has for aim to know things as they really are. Literature, on the other hand, has to do with the imaginary or ideal, the emotional, the æsthetic, in a word with subjective truth, and has for aim to portray things not so much according to their inner

nature as according to the impression they make upon us. To the scientist a rainbow is a phenomenon of chromatic dispersion; to the poet, it is a band of variegated colors with power to delight the eye and stir the emotions. Literature, while it deals with the realities of life, deals with them chiefly from the standpoint of personal impression and appreciation.

Questions and Studies

1. How are literature and science contrasted in point of content or subject-matter? 2. To what powers of the soul does each make its specific appeal? 3. Which has the greater educational value? (cf. *Idea of a University*, p. 263). "The upshot of the controversy is that both literature and physical science reveal to us phases of our environment; both train the mind by furnishing material for the apprehension and the judgment; both develop the imagination and discipline the reasoning faculties. Science, however, makes the larger appeal to the reason, and literature to the emotions" (Carpenter, Baker, and Scott: *The Teaching of English*, p. 157). Comment on this passage. 4. In what sense should we understand the power of imaginative and emotional stimulus that is claimed for science? What is to be understood by Tyndall's phrase, "the scientific use of the imagination"? 5. Can a scientific treatise be literature? What is

required to make it such? (cf. Newman's *Literature*, § 9). 6. What do you take to be the difference between history as literature and history as science? "The historian," says Woodrow Wilson in his essay, *Mere Literature*, "needs an imagination quite as much as he needs scholarship, and consummate literary art as much as candor and common honesty. Histories are written in order that the bulk of men may read and realize; and it is as bad to bungle the telling of the story as to lie, as fatal to lack a vocabulary as to lack knowledge. In no case can you do more than convey an impression, so various and complex is the matter. If you convey a false impression, what difference does it make how you convey it? In the whole process there is a nice adjustment of means to ends which only the artist can manage. There is an art of lying; there is equally an art, an infinitely more difficult art, of telling the truth." Discuss this passage. Why are imagination and literary art necessary for the historian? 7. "In 1842 Haydon wrote to Wordsworth, recalling a dinner party which took place many years before at the painter's house: 'Don't you remember Keats proposing "Confusion to the memory of Newton," and upon your insisting on an explanation before you drank it, his saying, "Because he destroyed the poetry of the rainbow by reducing it to a prism?"' Suppose the Atholl shepherd lad had been an optician and understood all the laws of light by which the effulgent hues of

sunrise were elicited; suppose, further, that he had been an astronomer, and as he saw the sun rise had begun to reflect: It is not the sun that I see rising, but it is the earth that is rotating on her own axis, and now turning her side toward the sun that causes all that I now see; and that axis is not vertical, but slants obliquely to the plane of its orbit—supposing these, and a hundred other truths, which physical astronomy teaches, had come into his mind, would he still have had that sublime joy?" (J. C. Shairp: *On Poetic Interpretation of Nature*, p. 49). Try to answer the question proposed in the last sentence of the passage. Are literature (poetry) and science really as antagonistic as Keats supposed? Are poetic wonder and scientific wonder incompatible? Does scientific progress check literary inspiration and growth?

G. LITERATURE AND MORALITY*

Literature is mainly a reproduction in artistic speech of human life and manners. As such it is never far away from that supremely vital side of human beings, the moral side. It deals not infrequently with problems of duty and conduct, with the eternal issues of right and wrong. The question of the relations between literature and morality is therefore a practical one for author and reader to-

* This section is largely an adaptation from the excellent *Theorie des Belles-lettres* of G. Longhaye, S. J.

gether. Is literature a law unto itself or must it subordinate its aims and methods to the dictates of the moral order? A few principles will help to answer the question.

1. Morality connotes the ultimate end of all human activity, namely, God. A human act is *moral* when it harmonizes with this ultimate end and *immoral* (in a technical sense) when it conflicts with it. As the ultimate end rises above and regulates every department of human activity, so, also, does morality. To suppose the contrary, to suppose, for example, that literary art is withdrawn from the regulative control of morality, is to suppose the scope of art to be equal or even superior to the scope of morality, which is God Himself. Morality, therefore, may not give way before the exigencies of art or enter into compromise with them. Art, literary art included, is a means, not an end in itself, and as such must remain subordinate in its aim and methods to the sovereign end of human life by respecting the laws of morality which make the attainment of that end a possibility. "(Naturalism) champions the autonomy of art in order to maintain its independence of religion and morality. It thereby sets itself in open contradiction to Christianity, since all things human, even art, are subject to the eternal law. Artistic expression is indeed neither the act of a blindly toiling genius nor that of an understanding governed by its own laws, but is the act of a free, re-

sponsible will. It affects not only the sight and perception of the spectator, but also his mental disposition and his will. It is in this respect that the laws of morality apply to art as a practical calling" (G. Gietmann, S. J., in *Catholic Encyclopedia*, art. *Æsthetics*).

2. An author's influence on the mind of his reader is summed up in the impressions which he creates. Impressions lead, in turn, to certain deliberate movements of the soul. I read a poem, a play, a story, a speech, a history. I experience during the reading and after it the most diverse emotions; love, hatred, pity, admiration, desire, aversion, joy, and the like. Moreover, these emotions are not mere instinctive, mechanical throbbings of the soul. My free will is borne along by them, accepts them, places upon them the seal of its approval. Now the responsibility of these emotions thus freely entertained is shared by the writer who supplied the stimulus. Again, sound philosophy recognizes moral responsibility in every deliberate exercise of the human will. Certain actions may, indeed, be classed as morally indifferent or neutral, but in theory only. In the concrete or in practice, as we say, every act of the human agent is either morally good or morally evil. Between these two extremes there is no middle or neutral ground where it may stand. The inference is obvious. To stir an impression, which, in turn, naturally begets an emotion of the soul deliberately and freely en-

tertained, is to stir the soul to a thing morally good or else morally evil. No third course is open to the responsible cause of the impression, the writer. "To act upon my soul is to act for good or for evil—a hard alternative from which no pretext of art, no consideration of æsthetics, can offer an escape."

3. To the stock objection that bad morality is sometimes good art one can answer that bad morality *as such* cannot be made *artistic*, *i. e.*, capable of stimulating true æsthetic delight. The pleasure which bad morality or the attempted exhibition of it in art is calculated to afford, is morbid, illicit, and exclusive by its very nature of genuine æsthetic emotion. Still, a work of art, however vicious, however objectionable on moral grounds, cannot conceivably be vicious in every single element and detail. It can scarcely fail to present some aspects, at least, of truth, goodness, and beauty, however much these may be obscured in the prevailing atmosphere of moral turpitude. "And so a work which I am right in pronouncing evil may be beautiful in part, by reason of the truth and goodness which it retains and in spite of false and vicious elements, which, of themselves, serve only to deform it."

4. A literary work which does not make for moral evil, will make for moral good in one of three ways:

a) *By Direct Inculcation of Some Spiritual or Religious Truth.* This is the preacher's meth-

od, the method of the pulpit. Literary art can be employed in no better or nobler service. Artistic quality and the open teaching of truth in the pulpit or out of it are not incompatible elements. Still, all things have their place and the direct lesson is usually (though not necessarily) out of place in the ordinary types of literary expression.

b) *By Indirect Inculcation of Some Spiritual or Religious Truth.* "Apart from every lesson in the proper sense of the term, apart from every direct incitement to virtue, an author acts upon the soul of the reader by the general truths which issue as net result from his work as a whole, and which constitute its *theme*." The theme, the moral lesson or message, is not obtruded upon the reader, is not couched in a formula frankly and repeatedly proclaimed. The reader is allowed the pleasure, a quite genuine one, of discovering it for himself.

c) *By Wholesome Impression.* "Shall we demand a theme in every literary composition in order to save the conscience of the writer? As a matter of fact, it is not easy to conceive a composition, however simple, that does not issue in some logical conclusion. And yet a work of this kind, if such there be, would still be useful, if only the impression it makes be wholesome and uplifting . . . By impression we understand what remains behind in the imagination and emotions rather than in the intellect after the book is closed or the curtain falls. It is a mental

state, oftentimes vague enough, in which are still floating about the images and sentiments awakened by the reading or the play. But what at first was confusion gradually settles down into a general disposition of mind, the outcome of scenes witnessed and emotions felt, rather than of thoughts and theories, a sort of contagion from the moral atmosphere which envelops the whole work. . . . And since, under penalty of being void of all literary merit, a work must result in some impression, be it what it may; since, too, this impression ever makes indirectly at least for or against the spiritual interests of the soul; a writer cannot in the end escape the alternative of either antagonizing good morals or advancing them. Suppose the content of a literary work to be ethically neutral, a thing quite possible; suppose even the impressions created by it to be ethically neutral, a thing, however, which is not possible; there remains at least this fact: the work sets in motion all the powers of our soul. Does it in so doing respect their essential order, or does it upset it? Surely, one of the two results must follow. If the work upsets the essential order of the faculties, it indirectly makes against morality; if it respects that order, if it stimulates all our faculties to normal and legitimate exercise, then by thus heightening their native perfection, it serves morality in a real, though indirect, fashion . . . Does it develop our fund of wholesome, cheerful common-sense? It prepares

us, at least, for virtues which it does not preach, a service of no mean value. Does it respect, does it develop within us the normal order of the soul's activities? In perfecting our nature it cannot be absolutely useless in regard to that higher order, the moral, to which it does not quite introduce us, but to which it renders us better fitted to ascend."

Questions and Studies

1. Are there two criteria of morality, one for life and one for art, or is there only one criterion for both? (Charles Lamb once made a curious defence of the immoral comedies of the Restoration period: "He protests that the world in which these characters move is so wholly artificial—a conventional world, quite apart from that of real life—that it is beside the mark to judge them by any moral standard. They are a world of themselves, almost as much as fairyland. It must be admitted that Lamb does not convince us of the sincerity of his reasoning and probably he did not convince himself" (Ainger: *Life of Charles Lamb*). 2. Can bad morality be good literature? (Bad morality is a negation of moral beauty, implies moral ugliness.) The content, at least in part, of certain poems, plays, and novels, of even classic standing, is of exceptionable morality. On the supposition that bad morality cannot be good literature, how can such productions be called literature at all? (Cf., *supra*.)

3. What are the limits to the portrayal in literature of criminal and immoral situations? According to the principle of contrast, virtue may sometimes be heightened by bringing it into juxtaposition with vice. (Cf. the villain in a play.) The artistic portrayal will stop at the point beyond which it cannot go without exciting ignoble passions in the reader or spectator, or becoming for him in some way an occasion of sin. 4. The principle is sometimes laid down, especially by writers of the realist school, that art should deal with life as it is, without reticence or reserve. Is this principle ethically sound? Is the best literature wholesome in moral tone? 5. Read Newman's striking analysis of literature from an ethical standpoint and summarize his views (*Idea of a University*, pp. 227-232). "I say, from the nature of the case, if literature is to be made a study of human nature, you cannot have a Christian literature. It is a contradiction in terms to attempt a sinless literature of sinful man" (229). Study these propositions (in their context) with a view to discussion.

UCLA-Young Research Library

PN45 .N411

yr



L 009 573 093 3

PN

45

N41 1

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY



AA 001 223 828 3

